Ex Libris Roberti Bethel

AN

ANSWER

TO THE

QUERIES,

CONTAINED IN

A LETTER to Dr. SHEBBEARE,

Printed in the PUBLIC LEDGER, *Auguſt* 10.

TOGETHER WITH

ANIMADVERSIONS ON TWO SPEECHES

In Defence of the PRINTERS of

A PAPER, ſubſcribed a SOUTH BRITON.

The FIRST pronounced by

The Right Hon. THOMAS TOWNSHEND,
in the Houſe of Commons,
And printed in the LONDON PACKET of *February* 18.

The SECOND by

The Right Learned Counſellor LEE,
in GUILDHALL,
And printed in the PUBLIC LEDGER of *Auguſt* 12.

In the Examination of which a Compariſon naturally ariſes between the public and private Virtues of Their Preſent Majeſties, and thoſe of King William and Queen Mary. The Merits, alſo, of Roman Catholics, and of Diſſenters from the Church of England, reſpecting Allegiance and Liberty, and their Claims to National Protection, are fairly ſtated, from their paſt and preſent Tranſactions.

By J. SHEBBEARE, *M. D.*

Falſus honor juvat, et mendax infamia terret
Quem niſi mendoſum et mendacem. HOR.

DUBLIN:
Printed for PAT. WOGAN on the Old-Bridge, (No. 23.)
oppoſite Uſher's-Quay. MDCCLXXV.

BRITISH MUSEUM
15
60
JAN

AN

ANSWER

TO THE

QUERIES, &c.

THERE are few propenſities more prevalent among the individuals of human kind, whoſe tranſactions have been the leaſt removed from the moſt common that can happen, than a perſuaſion that the daily occurrences of their lives are of ſo intereſting a kind, as to be highly deſerving the attention of the public. This opinion of their importance chiefly ariſes from the partiality of ſelf-love. Each of them not only obſerves, with a depreciating eye, the actions of other men; but beholds, in a too favourable aſpect, his own alſo. From this origin have ſprung the numerous memoirs and lives which have been obtruded on the world, not only by men who have been their own biographers; but by ſuch alſo who have applied, to the talents of others, through a conſcious deficiency in their own. The motive of my appearing before the publio, on this occaſion,

ariſes not from that cauſe, but from the deſire of not being deemed more culpable than I am; and of defending myſelf from ſuch calumny, as no man, the leaſt ſuſceptible of the emotions of an honeſt heart, can ſuffer to remain unanſwered, without being juſtly charged, either with an unpardonable inſenſibility to the claims of character; or with an impoſſibility of obviating the accuſations which are laid againſt him. For although no man of ſenſe will think it either neceſſary, or even prudent, to reply to the obloquy and invectives of anonymous writers, who may have defamed him by a relation of circumſtances that never exiſted; by miſrepreſentations of thoſe which have, when they are not of an immoral nature, and of no concern to the public; yet does it ſometimes happen, although the accuſer withhold his name, that the facts on which he grounds his accuſations may be incontrovertible, notwithſtanding the manner, in which they are repreſented, imparts a falſehood to all that he relates; and the nature of them may be ſo criminal, that to abſtain from attempting a refutation, would be juſtly conſidered as a conceſſion to their truth, and adequate to ſelf-condemnation.

Innumerable are the inſtances of the former kind of publications againſt me, to which I have never given the leaſt reply. Of the latter, there has appeared a paper, in the Public Ledger, of the 10th of Auguſt, which no man, who is not dead to every laudable ſenſation, can ſuffer and remain in ſilence. The malevolence it contains is directed againſt the moſt eſtimable part of every man's character, his integrity. It is ſolely on that account that I am induced, in this manner, to make my appeal. And I would willingly

lingly hope, that, on ſo intereſting an occaſion, the vindication of a private man will not be deemed an impertinent obtruſion on the public.

On the 29th of July, a paper was printed in the Public Ledger, under the denomination of "a character of Dr. Shebbeare." In this notable performance, it was ſaid, that "John Shebbeare "was bred an apothecary, if he had any breeding, "dubbed a doctor of phyſic at a foreign ſeminary, "where degrees are held in equal eſtimation as at "a Scotch univerſity: that is, aſſes might have, "if aſſes could *bray* or *pay* for them." This, I imagine, is the firſt time it has been aſſerted, that aſſes are *not* doctors of phyſic, becauſe they cannot *bray*. However, from this ſpecimen of this writer's wit, ſatire, and good manners, may it not be fairly inferred, that he is juſtly entitled, by his talents, to the degree of doctor, without being obliged to *pay* for them. In whatever part of the world I took my degree, I would hope that what I have written in phyſic, has neither diſgraced the univerſity from which I received it, nor induced the faculty to pronounce me a novice in my profeſſion.

However, "being thus dignified," he ſays, "I "ſet up for a writer, and received ſubſcriptions, "to a conſiderable amount, for an hiſtory of Eng-"land, which, to this hour, has never been pub-"liſhed." To this part, he ſhall receive an anſwer, when I come to examine his paper of the 10th of Auguſt.

He then ſays, I "poured out ſuch foul abuſe on "the late king, that the miniſtry, more loyal "than the preſent, proceeded againſt me with "juſtice." In this place, I apprehend, this gentleman-like writer lies under a miſtake. In what did I pour *foul abuſe* on the late king, or on any

other perſon? And when he pronounced the miniſtry of that king to be more loyal than the preſent, had he forgotten that theſe loyal miniſters of George the ſecond, when rebellion was in the realm, in one body threatened to deſert him, unleſs he diſmiſſed lord Granville from his ſervice, and obtained their end? have the preſent miniſtry preſumed to treat their ſovereign with an inſult ſo egregiouſly diſloyal? have any miniſters ſince his majeſty's acceſſion to the throne, ſacrificed the honour and the welfare of Great Britain to German intereſts? have they chained a Britiſh fleet in the bay of Gibraltar, whilſt thoſe of France were uniting, in order to obtain the retreat of a French army, from the confines of Hanover? have they defeated an expedition againſt Rocheforte, for the ſake of concluding a treaty at Cloſter-Seven: or are ſuch tranſactions the proofs of loyalty in this writer's opinion? if they proſecuted me with juſtice, did I not atone for the offence with a ſufficient ſuffering? however, he adds, "the doctor, "by this, obtained his end: he received a pu-"niſhment, which, to a virtuous character, would "be worſe than death; to him it was *diſtinguiſhed* "exaltation." Does it not ſeem to be a ſingular conceit of his, that I wrote on purpoſe to be puniſhed? and, if the puniſhment can conſtitute the crime, I am apprehenſive this ingenious writer will be mightily puzzled to prove that the martyrs, and even the apoſtles, whoſe puniſhments were greater than mine, were not men of leſs virtuous character than I am. As to my exaltation, it was diſtinguiſhed enough. And, if that were my end in writing, I obtained it. And ſo far am I from a deſire of engroſſing ſuch diſtinguiſhed exaltation, that I ſincerely wiſh the writer of this paper, and

of

of another, of the 10th of Auguſt, may be rewarded according to his deſerts; and then he will be equallv diſtinguiſhed and exalted.

Upon this exaltation, it ſeems, "I became noticed and inſolent: ever ſupercilious, and now "contemptibly arrogant, affected an air of greatneſs, and frowned diſapprobation on kings, "treated Galen with contempt, no longer thought "of ſupplying hoſpitals with bandages, but preſcribed for the *conſtitution*, propoſed ſtyptics to "heal its wounds, and wiſhed, like another Sacheverel, to ſee my comely portrait grace the "bottom of an old-maid's urinal:" all which being ſo prettily told, ſo ſtrictly decent, and ſo important to the public, what pity it is that I cannot acquieſce in the truth of things that would do me ſo much honour!

This gentleman-like writer now ſays, "the "doctor had his wiſh; he became popular; if to "be known for a libeller of the king, and deſpiſed "as a traducer of the revolution, can be deemed "popularity." Now, it ſo happens that I was not accuſed of libelling the king, or of traducing the revolution, but of writing a ſixth letter to the people of England, and therefore I could neither be found guilty of, nor known for, either of thoſe offences: nor did I become popular on theſe, or on any other accounts. And yet, the *firſt* of them, alone, hath ſince ſufficed to make *one* man the moſt popular, and the moſt ſignal patriot of the age. He continues: "and thus, pointed at "by the rabble, diſdained by men of ſenſe, and "execrated by every friend to the family on the "throne, I was a proper ſubject for miniſters like "the preſent to penſion, to patronize, and to "employ." Among the men of ſenſe, will this writer

writer preſume to count himſelf, who in every line gives demonſtration that he muſt be eminent among the rabble: or among the friends of the family on the throne, whoſe allegiance expired with the late king: if we may judge from his ſilence reſpecting his preſent ſovereign, and his ſarcaſm on the miniſters?

Theſe miniſters, I find, are as reprobate as myſelf. And, as *ſimiles ſimilibus gaudent*, I expect they will improve their patronage of me. For can it be conſiſtent, either with honour or conſcience, to ſuffer me to be traduced, as magnificently as if I were a lord of the treaſury at leaſt, for ſo ſmall a ſum as two hundred a year? if this circumſtance be not duly regarded, to be calumniated can no longer be eſteemed the inſeparable characteriſtic of a great man. For their own ſakes, therefore, I humbly hope that they will exalt me, not in this writer's way, that I may approach more nearly to their height; and that no further diſgrace be brought on their greatneſs, by a liberality of malediction on a perſon ſo inferior as I am, both in rank and profit, and ſuch as would do honour to a ſecondary, if not a prime miniſter. As to the affair of my employment, this gentleman and a multiplicity of others, by their judicious treatment of his majeſty and his miniſters, the propriety of their repreſentations, the truth of their aſſertions, the force of their arguments, the wit and ſatire of their publications, have driven the band of penſioners quite out of the field; rendered all writing on the ſide of adminiſtration unneceſſary; and produced the very effects which were diametrically oppoſite to their intention. Have they not evinced, in a manner that can require no anſwer, that his majeſty is an arrant Jacobite, and is now actually preparing to

ſurrender

ſurrender his crowns, kingdoms, and dominions, to the pretender: that in order to facilitate this wonderful revolution, he is now, by all poſſible means, endeavouring to bring popery dingdong into this realm; to eſtabliſh the maſs by bell, book and candle, and within ſix weeks to rekindle the fires in Smithfield; that the archbiſhops and biſhops, who proteſt againſt the popiſh religion, and the miniſters who proteſt againſt all religions, are united heart and hand in this idolatrous deſign. That, by aſſenting to a ſtatute enacted for the eſtabliſhment of a legiſlature, in Canada, according to the requeſt of the ſubjects in that province, his majeſty hath violated his coronation oath, in which he ſwears to govern according to the ſtatutes of this realm; and that by thus acting, according to this requeſt of the Canadians, he hath made them all ſlaves, they and their progeny for ever.

In like manner have they not proved, that his majeſty hath moſt egregiouſly infracted the firſt article of Magna Charta, in which it is ſaid, "the "church of England ſhall be free, enjoy all her "rights entire, and her liberties unhurt." That this infraction is accompliſhed by permitting the Canadians to enjoy the religion in which they were bred, which was granted them on the capitulation at Quebec, and is that very religion, which alone exiſted in England, when, for the preſervation of the church, this very Magna Charta was made? all which things are proved in a manner ſo convincing, that nothing remains to be written againſt them that can add vigour to the effects they have produced in the minds of all men of common underſtandings. By theſe means are we

not

not ſupplanted, and they become the miniſter's beſt friends? And, if the effect may be divided from the cauſe, are they not the propereſt objects for being penſioned? But alas! ſuch are the ſublime and diſintereſted ſentiments of their ſouls, and ſuch their animoſity to corruption, that the thought of forſaking patriotiſm for pence, can find no entrance into ſuch pure and conſtitutional boſoms.

Naturaliſts have remarked that, of all animals, a hog is the leaſt formed for ſwimming: and whenever he preſumes to undertake it, that from his want of ſkill in that exerciſe, he cuts his throat by the miſapplication of his fore-feet; periſhes in the preſumption; is given to the dogs; and men are deprived of many a good ham and flitch of bacon. This animal I take to be the archetype of the preſent antiminiſterial writers. For, by having engaged the right hoof in that taſk, to which, by nature, they are unequal, they have cut their own throats; are become carrion; ſtink in the noſtrils of all honeſt men; are food only for the hounds of modern patriots; and the world is thereby robbed of many a ſtout ploughman and nimble taylor.

On this account, I humbly intreat that the patriotic gentlemen, who have the intereſt of poor old England ſo much at heart, and find their preſent penmen ſo abſolutely incorrigible, will withhold them from theſe acts of ſuicide, and hire ſome able-headed writer, to publiſh ſomething clever againſt the miniſtry. And I wiſh it might contain a plentiful ſprinkling of point, epigram, and antitheſis, dreſſed in ſublime diction, adorned with the blooming flowers of rhetoric, and animated by a ſtrut of important ſtyle, raiſing private events

into

into public miſchiefs, converting meritorious characters into the deſtroyers of their country, and the vileſt of men into the moſt diſintereſted defenders of the conſtitution, and the friends of liberty. Unleſs this be ſpeedily done, I greatly apprehend that we poor penſioners muſt, through mere policy, be obliged to write againſt the miniſters, in order to produce a calumny that may be worthy of a reply; and thereby to preſerve ourſelves in ſome degree of conſideration with thoſe at the head of public affairs.

The gentleman, having exerted his amazing talents on me, proceeds to a ſecond exerciſe of them, on my ſon, and ſays, "John Shebbeare, "the ſon of the former, was deſigned for an at-"torney's office, where he might have cut a fi-"gure;" and thus, this gentleman proves himſelf to be as great a conjurer as he is a writer. For he not only diſcovers my deſigns; but pronounces for what my ſon is fit, without information of the former, or experience of the latter. He perſiſts: "at the inſtigation, if not at the expence of Dr. "Wilſon, he was ſent to Oxford, to learn Jaco-"bitiſm, under the famous Dr. King, and to "preach up obedience, for conſcience ſake, to the "*de facto* king on the throne." It is time enough to anſwer the *if*, when it is aſſerted as a fact; in the mean while, neither I nor my ſon have the leaſt inclination to diſown the favours we have received from Dr. Wilſon: whatever they were, we accepted them with due acknowledgement, and remember them with gratitude. But if my ſon were ſent to learn Jacobitiſm at Oxford, he egregiouſly miſapplied his time; even according to the opinion of this able writer. For it has been hitherto thought, that Jacobites are taught obedience,

for

for *conſcience* ſake, to a king *de jure*. But, it ſeems, my ſon learnt to preach obedience, for *conſcience* ſake, to a king *de facto*. Which is juſt as ſenſible as to ſay, that, being bound an apprentice to a ſhoe-maker, he learnt his trade by making hob-nails. Now it ſo happens that he is convinced that our ſovereign on the throne is king *de jure*, as well as *de facto*. Does not this circumſtance fully evince how admirably this gentleman is qualified to write on political ſubjects?

He continues; "happily, this young man's "parts not riſing above mediocrity, he has neither "diſgraced the kingdom nor himſelf, by any pub-"lication in the literary way." I am obliged to the gentleman for his civility: and am heartily ſorry I cannot return him the compliment, reſpect-ing *his* parts and *his* publications. However, it ſeems, "Dr. Wilſon employed this ſon of mine to "prove, for the ſatisfaction of the conſcientious, "that a ſtained-glaſs window might be ſet up over "the altar-piece of St. Margaret's church, with-"out an idolatrous intention. This proof, worked "up into a pamphlet, was ſoon found on ſtalls; "for even the ſinging boys thought it a deſpicable "compoſition." The moſt ſtriking part of this paragraph is its conſiſtency with the former. For, it ſeems, "the *you g man*, who had not diſgraced "himſelf by any literary publication," had, never-theleſs, diſgraced himſelf by publiſhing a com-poſition too deſpicable for the approbation of the ſinging boys, who, as they are, undoubtedly, moſt excellent judges, ought to be deemed of great weight in literary ſubjects. It appears, how-ever, from this circumſtance of the ſinging boys, that this diſcerning writer hath miſtaken St. Mar-garet's church for Weſtminſter-Abbey: for to the latter,

latter, I conceive, the ſinging boys belong. "The "*proof*, however, was worked up into a *pamphlet*," which paſſage, had it been written by a man of common underſtanding *only*, would have been, the *pamphlet* worked up into a *proof*, "was ſoon found "on ſtalls;" where it will be in vain to look for the incomparable publications of this gentleman. They have received their proper application, have diſcharged their duty, and are ſunk to that place of repoſe, which is deſtined for all ſuch uſeful performances.

Errors, like ſtraws, upon the ſurface flow:
He that would ſeek for *pearls* muſt dive *below*.

The gentleman proceeds: "the young man, "quitting all further attempts to book-making, "took orders, ſwallowed the whole thirty-nine, "and bleſſed himſelf to think, that what ſtuck in "other people's throats, the capaciouſneſs of his "*thorax* could digeſt, without a ſingle palliative: "and as the father commenced politician, ſo the "ſon commenced theologue, through neceſſity." As to the "book-making" I ſhall ſay nothing: but, if this deſcription of this young man be to be relied on, he muſt be of as ſingular a conformation in his bodily, as in his mental parts. Firſt, he has ſwallowed the whole thirty-nine *orders*. Till now, I never heard of more than *two*; prieſts and deacons. In the writings of almoſt any other ſcribe, it might have been imagined, that he had miſtaken orders for *articles*. But in him who talks of the thorax as the place of digeſtion, can it be leſs than ſheer ignorance? however, it ſeems, this young man is the only clergyman, in whoſe throat theſe thirty-nine *orders* did not ſtick, which ſeems

to

to be ſomewhat ſurpriſing, ſince ſo many thouſands are now walking about, all alive, unchoaked by them. Be that as it may: they were cleverly ſwallowed into his capacious *thorax*. Till now, it has been thought that the throat led into the *ſtomach*; but, in my young man, it leads into the *thorax*, where it ſeems, they are digeſted, without "palliatives." Hence it is clear, that my ſon has his ſtomach where others have their lungs, and his lungs where others have their ſtomachs; or that the ſtomach is placed in the *thorax* together with the lungs. As this is the only true and genuine formation of a church of England divine; as my young man is the only perſon ſo formed; and he alone has ſwallowed the whole thirty-nine *orders*, and bleſſed himſelf that they did not ſtick in his throat, why are the miniſtry ſo blind to ſuch ſingular qualifications? why do they not make him a *dean* at leaſt to begin with? is not this amazing neglect of advancing the only man who is truly formed to be *every thing* in the church of England, a moſt convincing proof, and the only one I wiſh to have removed, that his majeſty and his miniſters are rank papiſts. For to what other reaſons can it be imputed, that the only man in the kingdom, ſo truly, ſo eccleſiaſtically, and ſo canonically formed, ſhould remain without preferment? And is not this the firſt time that palliatives have been ſaid to digeſt? Will it not prove an embarraſſing ſubject, to decide whether this gentleman be more incomparable as a divine, an anatomiſt, a phyſician, or a writer? and, let me tell him, if *neceſſity* made me a politician, and the young man a *theologue*, as he calls him, we have much to offer in our behalf, from being compelled by ſo irreſiſtable a cauſe.

The

The gentleman now returns to me: "the ſuc-
"ceſs of the one, however, involved in it the
"proſperity of the other." Being found guilty of a libel, ſtanding on the pillory, three years impriſonment, and a fine, ſeem to be but an odd ſucceſs on my ſide. However, it involved in it the proſperity of my young man. I have heard it ſaid, "happy is the child whoſe father goes to the "devil;" but I never heard, till now, that the ſame good fortune attends the children of thoſe who ſtand on the pillory, yet I hope it will prove true. However, the writer may take the hint, be equally ſucceſsful, and involve in it the proſperity of his own progeny, by the like means. The holes are open to him. He now adds, "for as old Sheb-
"beare exhibited his bronzed phyz through the
"hole of a pillory, as he was elevated on a wood-
"en roſtrum, he gained admirers (as culprits at
"the gallows gain pity) from the beholders." Now, as I was not the maker of my own phyz, by what means could I prevent its qualities? I exhibited the beſt face, and the beſt apparel I had; and I was attended with good company. And, if I gained admirers, I ſee no occaſion for exhibiting a better. As to the compariſon of pity and the gallows, I would adviſe this writer to reſerve the latter for himſelf, as the only means by which he can obtain the former. "Amongſt theſe behold-
"ers," as he ſays, "ſome of them complimented
"my ſapient ſon with a valuable church living." Now it ſo happens, that this living was preſented by a lady, as guardian to her two granddaughters; the firſt of theſe was then in Lancaſhire, and the children were then unborn. On this account, I humbly preſume that neither of them could

could have been my beholder on that day of exaltation.

And now ſays this incomparable ſcribe, " if " the reader's indignation is excited, by the con- " duct of the former, that indignation ſhould be " a little ſoftened, out of pity to the latter, who " has ſome virtues." I am glad he acknowledges that. But why, then has he abuſed him, without provocation? he then adds, " but what virtues " either of them may poſſeſs are almoſt totally " eclipſed by an immoderate ſhare of vanity?" and thus, it ſeems that I have ſome virtues alſo. But what is this immoderate ſhare of vanity? it is that, " thoſe who know the family can bear " witneſs, that it was no uncommon thing (after " the doctor's exaltation on the pillory) for them " to boaſt, that they were of French extraction, " and allied, by the grandmother's ſide, to ſome " of the antient kings of France." As this gentleman ſeems to be the very quinteſcence of truth, it cannot be doubted that he knows ſomebody, who knows the family, who can bear witneſs to the preceding circumſtance. But it is all news to me. For I am and ever ſhall be too much an Engliſhman, to entertain the vanity of being thought of French extraction. Unleſs, it can be proved, that I am deſcended from his moſt chriſtian majeſty. Then, indeed, *my* loving couſin, the king of France, may recommend me to *his* loving couſin, the king of Great-Britain, and ſome advantage may be derived from my conſanguinity. However, I am more than ſuſpicious, that my pedigree cannot *bear witneſs* to this *deſcent*, the moſt extraordinary, I believe, that has ever been known. It is that I am allied, by *the* grandmother's ſide, to ſome of the antient kings of France. Till this time,

time, I always imagined that, like other men, I had a father and mother, and that each of them had a father and mother alſo; and therefore that I muſt have had *two* grandmothers. But it ſeems I have been conſtantly miſtaken. For I am deſcended directly from *one* only, *the* grandmother, and allied, by her ſide, to the kings of France. And hereby it ſhould ſeem that this alliance was not continued, like that of other men, through a father and mother. I confeſs it puzzles me much to explain, by what method of procreation I can have had but *one* grandmother; or, without parents, even ſo much as one. And if I had a father and mother, how one woman can be *the* grandmother of both of them, unleſs mine were brother and ſiſter, which, I believe, they were not. This ſtory, of the grandmother and my deſcent, would, I imagine, puzzle the whole college of heralds; not only to aſcertain *the* grandmother, but alſo to exemplify, by any method now in uſe, my alliance to the French monarchs, without the intervention of two parents. As this boaſt did not take place till after my exaltation on the pillory, it would ſeem as if I obtained this high alliance by *aſcent*, and not by *deſcent*. And that, when my body was raiſed above the heads of the people, my blood, alſo, was exalted above theirs, into blood-royal. But, this gentleman being the ſole herald of this deſcent, he muſt explain it, or it will never be underſtood.

"Such," ſays this worthy writer, "is Dr. Sheb-
" beare: ſuch is the rev. John Shebbeare, his
" ſon:" and then I readily allow, that *he* is, in conformation of body, and that *I* am, in genealogical deſcent, not to be equalled in the univerſe.

A thouſand

A thouſand ſuch papers would have been applied to their proper uſe, unnoticed by me, as a multiplicity of that kind had already been, but on the 10th of Auguſt, the following letter appeared in the Public Ledger.

For the Public Ledger.

To Doctor Shebbeare.

Sir,

As you ſeem diſpoſed by candour, to anſwer every queſtion which may be aſked with good-nature, I think it the proper time to propound the following queries:

1. Did you not, many years ago, ſolicit ſubſcriptions for an hiſtory of England, which you engaged to finiſh, and declared was then in great forwardneſs?

2. Did you not receive ſubſcriptions for this ſaid hiſtory, to a very conſiderable amount?

3. Has the work (which ſo many years ago was in great forwardneſs) ever yet appeared in print?

4. Had you at the time you received the ſubſcriptions the ſmalleſt intention that it ſhould; have you at this inſtant the ſmalleſt intention that it ſhall ever be publiſhed?

5. Ought you not, in common honeſty, to return the money to the ſubſcribers; or in common honour to diſcharge the conditional obligation for which you received it?

6. If you do neither of theſe, have we any occaſion to ſearch the records to prove your infamy? muſt we look to the pillory for the beſt whole-length picture of the man; to his public conduct for the beſt miniature of his moral turpitude?

7. In caſe of your death have you deputed your ſon to return the ſubſcribers their money; or is he to write the hiſtory his father was paid before-hand for undertaking? an hiſtory from yourſelf would be dull enough in all conſcience; an hiſtory from your ſon would be a ſcald-miſerable production indeed!

8. For what did lord Bute procure you a penſion? for the punctual performance of your promiſe, or for the ſcandalous perſonal abuſe you caſt on his late majeſty? if you keep your word with government no better than with your ſubſcribers, adminiſtration, if they thought of purchaſing your honour, were moſt confoundedly taken in.

9. With what ſhadow of reaſon can you complain of being treated "with ill manners in the "ledger," when you have been ſet upon, though not in the pillory, for villifying your ſovereign in the groſſeſt terms?

10. Inſtead of reviewing the writings of other men, would not your time be more properly employed in a review of your actions, and a preparation for the grave, to which you are now moſt viſibly haſtening?

11. Will it not be very complaiſant in you to anſwer ſuch of theſe queries as relate to the ſubſcription money received for your "hiſtory of "England?"

A Subſcriber.

In my anſwer to A. M's letter, I ſay, "this "precaution, however, I think fit to give the "editors of thoſe papers, to whom Mr. A. M. "has already tranſmitted his letters, that they in-"ſert nothing under that ſignature, which they "have not actually received. And to this I am

" induced by two reaſons. Firſt, that thoſe who " have ſhewn themſelves ſo cordially diſpoſed to " treat me with ill manners, may not lay hold " on this occaſion to indulge their ſlander under " that ſignature. And ſecondly, that Mr. A. M. " may have nothing imputed to his charge which " he has not written: nor I have any thing to an- " ſwer which proceeds not from that perſon. And " I ſhall be under no apprehenſion of not diſ- " proving all that he can adduce, and of not ſatis- " fying the public that the whole which he hath " aſſerted, in his letter, is a futile tale and a " groundleſs accuſation."

From the preceding paſſage, it appears that this correſpondent of mine has taken occaſion to ſay, in the introduction to the queries, " as you ſeem " diſpoſed, by candour, to anſwer every queſtion " which may be aſked with good-nature," &c. and from hence has thought proper to take up a paſſage of the firſt paper in the ledger, where it is ſaid, I have received ſubſcriptions for an hiſtory of England, which, to this hour, has never been publiſhed. He then aſſumes the ſignature of " a ſubſcriber," and with good-nature, as he avers, propounds the antecedent queries. It does not to me appear on what grounds he can conclude that, becauſe I had limited the ill manners and ſlander, with which I might be treated, to the ſubjects ſolely of papers, under the ſignature of A. M. that therefore I ſeem diſpoſed to anſwer every queſtion, which may be aſked, under every other. Might not the perſon, to whom I had lent my ſurtout, have as reaſonably laid claim to the uſe of all the clothes I poſſeſs? and how the queries, which he aſks, can be deemed to proceed from *good-nature*, is paſt my conception.

I will

I will now give both diſtinct and faithful anſwers to every query.

Query firſt, Did you not, many years ago, ſolicit ſubſcriptions for an hiſtory of England, which you engaged to finiſh, and declared was then in great forwardneſs?——Anſwer, I did ſolicit ſuch ſubſcriptions, for a firſt volume of an hiſtory of England, but not in the manner you repreſent it, in your firſt paper, as preceding my impriſonment: it was after I was confined in the King's Bench. I engaged to finiſh it; but I never declared that it was in great forwardneſs, becauſe it was not then begun.

Q. 2d, Did you not receive ſubſcriptions to a very conſiderable amount?——A. Not ſufficient to pay for paper and printing. And, as a ſpecimen of what I received from thoſe who, I thought, were the moſt likely to promote it, the ſubſcriptions from the lords and gentlemen of the Cocoa-tree amounted but to ſeventeen guineas. But the ſmallneſs of this ſum is, by no means, offered as an excuſe for the delay in printing it.

Q. 3d, Has the work (which ſo many years ago was in great forwardneſs) ever yet appeared in print?——A. The work was never ſaid to be in great forwardneſs, nor has it yet appeared in print.

Q. 4th, Had you, at the time you received the ſubſcriptions, the ſmalleſt intention that it ſhould? have you, at this inſtant, the ſmalleſt intention that it ſhall ever be publiſhed?——A. The firſt receipts which were delivered, were for a firſt volume of an hiſtory of England, from the revolution to the preſent time. But, at the perſuaſion of my friends, I was induced to alter my deſign, and

receipts were iſſued for a firſt volume of the hiſtory of England, and of the conſtitution thereof, from its origin to the preſent time. That volume I wrote, and had it tranſcribed, whilſt I was in priſon: it is now in my poſſeſſion. Of every receipt I delivered to my friends, to be diſpoſed of, and of every guinea (the terms of the ſubſcription) I received, a regular account was kept, which I now have. Both of theſe ſhall be open to the inſpection of the writer of theſe queries, if he be in fact a ſubſcriber; and of every other who may chuſe to receive ſuch ſatisfaction. Is it not therefore too manifeſt to be denied, that at the time I propoſed to write this hiſtory, that I intended the publication of it? with what other imaginable deſign could I have given myſelf the pains of writing it? and although many circumſtances of a private and domeſtic nature muſt be included in the ſubſequent exculpation of myſelf, which few are willing to relate; yet I will poſtpone that and every other conſideration for the ſake of truth, and the preſervation of my integrity. I will, therefore, without diſguiſe or reſervation, candidly aſſign my reaſons for the delay in printing; and declare my preſent intentions.

A few days before my being tried, for writing the ſixth letter to the people of England, the dutcheſs of Queenſberry, with great juſtice, obtained an injunction, to ſtop the publiſhing of the continuation of lord Clarendon's hiſtory, which I had printed, and advertiſed, in conſequence of a written agreement, between Francis Gwynn, eſq; and me. In this agreement it was ſpecified that I ſhould be at the expence of paper, printing, and all others, and then that the profit of the work

ſhould

ſhould be equally divided between us. In this obligation, that worthy ſquire declares himſelf to be juſtly entitled to the manuſcript from which it was printed: notwithſtanding which, as it afterwards appeared, this very manuſcript had been ſurreptitiouſly obtained. Great part of the money for printing it had been paid by me; and it was not till ſix years after the injunction was obtained, that the cauſe was heard, in the court of King's Bench, before lord Mansfield; when, I obtained a verdict, for all the expences incurred by printing the preceding work, amounting to more than five hundred pounds. Of that ſum, almoſt one half had been waſted, on my ſide, in the courts of chancery and law. During my confinement, I never received, as preſents, more than twenty guineas, from all the world. And it may eaſily being imagined, that my circumſtances were not improved by three year's impriſonment. I had no club of partiſans, to maintain me during that time; to diſcharge my debts; nor even the fine, which I was obliged to pay, after a three year's confinement, for a ſingle offence. Notwithſtanding the difficulties which inevitably aroſe from theſe particulars, and although an inſolvent act was paſſed, ſoon after his majeſty's acceſſion to the throne, and my circumſtances might have apologized for my taking that opportunity which it offered; I, nevertheleſs, declined from availing myſelf of that occaſion, to evade the payment of my debts. I preferred the labour of endeavouring to pay them, and the riſk of being again impriſoned if I did not ſucceed. But thank heaven I am in no danger of a ſecond impriſonment on that account. And this diſinclination to avail myſelf

of

of the preceding means, will, I hope, be received as ſome proof, as I am not diſpoſed to free myſelf, without *payment*, from the demands of *money*, by *methods* which that act *allowed*, that I am *not* inclined to *acquire it* by *fradulent* meaſures.

As it was impracticable, whilſt I was in confinement, to procure that variety of books; or to apply to manuſcript authorities, for all that was requiſite to the compleating of this firſt volume, I found, on being releaſed from my impriſonment; and on application to the former only, that the volume, which I had written, was incorrect, inſufficient, and erroneous, in too many particulars, to admit of its being publiſhed, without injuſtice to my ſubſcribers, and reprehenſions on myſelf. Into this diſpleaſing ſituation I had been miſled, by relying on the authorities of modern hiſtorians, who pretend to cite the authors from whence their materials are taken, many of whom appear never to have ſeen them; but implicitly to have copied one another, and all of them manifeſtly defective; not only in the authorities they ſhould have ſought, but in their omiſſions and miſrepreſentations of thoſe whom they had conſulted: more eſpecially reſpecting thoſe parts of the old German codes, on which our conſtitution is erected, and without which, it cannot be properly explained or underſtood. Such being the real ſituation of things, I perceived that more time than I could expect to live would be neceſſarily required, for ſo extenſive a work, as the whole hiſtory I had propoſed; and that a ſingle volume, or even a few volumes of an hiſtory incomplete, would, by no means, anſwer either the intention of my ſubſcribers, or my own. I determined, therefore, to change my plan,

and

and to include, in one volume, that which might require no others to compleat this new deſign.

From the day I left the King's Bench priſon to the preſent, I declined all ſolicitation of ſubſcriptions: and, although by much the greateſt part of the receipts I iſſued are not returned, nor the money which anſwers to them. I never have enquired, by letter or otherwiſe, what was the event of them; nor have I received more than eleven guineas, the laſt of which was ſo long ſince as the 8th of March, 1763. And this I am ready to prove, by the book, in which are entered all the receipts I ever diſtributed, and every guinea I have received.

In conſequence of this alteration, I reſolved to exert my beſt abilities, not only to trace the conſtitution of England from its origin, in the woods of Germany, as Monſieur De Monteſquieu expreſſes it, but from the firſt principles in human nature, from which the formation of all kinds of government is derived. With this view I have attempted an analyzation of the mental and corporeal faculties, in order to ſhew in what manner they reciprocally influence each other in the various actions of man, not only as an individual, but as a gregarious being, impelled by nature to aſſociate in communities. From hence I have attempted to delineate, in what manner legiſlature ſprang and proceeded from its ſource, through that variety of meanders, which it hath formed in its current, both before and ſince the introduction of one common ſign, whereby to expreſs the intrinſic value, not only of all the productions of nature and of art, but even of the human faculties, as they are now eſtimated. To compare the conſtitutions of thoſe different ſtates, which have been, and are the moſt celebrated in

ancient

ancient and modern hiſtory, with each other, and with that of England; and then to derive ſome reaſonable grounds for the determination of that which ſeems to be the moſt conſentaneous with the primogenial inſtitutes of nature, and the happineſs of human kind. In conſequence of this intent, the manners that ſucceſſively aroſe and prevailed in ſuch ſtates, the benefits and miſchiefs which enſued from them, are delineated, in order to explain on what foundation the welfare of national communities may moſt probably be eſtabliſhed.

But from the inevitable obligations, not only of ſupporting my own family, but thoſe, alſo, whom, as ſon and brother, it was my duty to ſuſtain for forty years; and which, reſpecting the claims of the latter, ſtill continues, it will be eaſily diſcerned, that many an avocation muſt have proceeded from theſe circumſtances, as well as from a ſenſe of gratitude to his majeſty, in defence of whoſe government, I have thought it my duty occaſionally to exert my beſt abilities. Theſe truths will, I hope, offer a reaſonable apology for the retardment of the publication.

In this laſt deſign, however, laborious and difficult as it is, I have advanced to a conſiderable degree: and this manuſcript I am, at all times, ready to produce as an indubitable evidence of the truth of what I declare. This work I ſhall now finiſh, with all practicable expedition. To the completion of it, I ſhall now conſign my remaining days, yet not ſo invariably, as to neglect my duty of writing in other reſpects. And, thank heaven! I am neither ſo advanced in age, or reduced by infirmities, as to create a reaſonable ſuſpicion that I may not live longer than to finiſh it. Such is my anſwer to this injurious query; in

which

which I am treated as a felon, who has violated the laws, by obtaining money under falſe pretences.

Q. 5th, Ought you not, in common honeſty, to return the money to the ſubſcribers, or, in common honour, to diſcharge the conditional obligation, for which you received it?——A. Undoubtedly, I ought to perform the former, if I do not execute the latter. This, I have ſhewn, I have long been, and am now engaged in. No time was ever fixed, for the delivery of the books; and therefore I cannot have exceeded any engagement. And there are various inſtances, of which one is very recent, that of a gentleman, who has conſtantly received ſubſcriptions, for a time much more conſiderable, than that between my receiving the firſt ſubſcription and this day, who has honourably diſcharged the obligation. And, from a like behaviour, nothing but death ſhall prevent me alſo.

Q. 6th, If you do neither of theſe, have we any occaſion to ſearch the records, to prove your infamy? muſt we look to the pillory, for the beſt whole-length picture of the man; to his public conduct, for the beſt miniature of his moral turpitude?——A. What I have done, and ſhall do, reſpecting *either* of theſe, I have already declared, in my anſwer to the preceding query. And, thus, you muſt ſearch the records, to prove what you call my infamy, for it cannot be proved by what you ſay. But remember, it is not the *ſcaffold*, but the *crime*, that conſtitutes the *infamy* of puniſhment. Take my whole-length picture from the pillory, if you like it; and the miniature, alſo, from the moral turpitude of my public conduct, as you call it: for know, that although that conduct

duct were illegal, it was not immoral. Unleſs to deliver ſuch truths, as have never been controverted, in defence of the rights and liberties of my native country, be an immoral act. The laws, indeed, may make *truth* a *libel*; but can they alter the nature of things, and make that a moral turpitude, which as ſubjects of this kindom we ought to perform? Review this query. And, if you are ſuſceptible of the leaſt ſenſation of an honeſt heart, place yourſelf, a volunteer, on the pillory; and prove, at leaſt, as you are capable of the infamous act, of wantonly invading the character of an honeſt man; that, conſcious of this moral turpitude in yourſelf, and of the libellous calumny of your queries, you can repent as well as tranſgreſs; and, by that act of morality, at once do juſtice to me, by doing juſtice on yourſelf.

Q. 7th, In caſe of your death, have you deputed your ſon, to return the ſubſcribers their money? or is he to write the hiſtory his father was paid beforehand for undertaking? an hiſtory from yourſelf would be dull enough in all conſcience: an hiſtory from your ſon would be a ſcald-miſerable production indeed!——A. I have, already, told you, I do not intend to die till what I propoſe be finiſhed. If I do, care ſhall be taken reſpecting what you aſk. And, if you chuſe a farther ſatisfaction, let me have the pleaſure of ſeeing your *good-natured face*, and you ſhall receive that which ſhall content you. But what right, under the term *ſubſcriber*, even with your real name annexed, can you have to treat my *ſon* in ſo illiberal a manner? or even me, unleſs you had firſt enquired the reaſons why the hiſtory was not publiſhed? had you forged a ſubſcription to a draft for five pounds, you had merited a halter by the laws.

But

But have not you invented a new kind of forgery, more injurious than the former, by aſſuming that term to which you are not entitled, and which is infinitely more deſerving a public puniſhment? for who exiſts and deſerves the name of man, that does not eſtimate his character beyond his money! therefore altho' the laws cannot commit you to the hands of the public executioner, yet juſtice would, for this unprovoked and audacious invaſion of my character. But if you be a real ſubſcriber, declare your name, live not beneath the guilt of ſo foul a forgery, repent of the iniquitous intention to purloin that which *is the immediate jewel of our ſouls.*

As to the merit of my writings and my ſons, theſe ſhall ſpeak for themſelves. If they poſſeſs no merit, you can neither impart it, by your applauſe, nor, if they do, deprive them of it, by your defamation.

Q. 8th, For what did lord Bute procure you a penſion? for the punctual performance of your promiſe? or for the ſcandalous perſonal abuſe you caſt on his late majeſty? if you keep your word with government no better than with your ſubſcribers, adminiſtration, if they thought of purchaſing your honour, were moſt confoundedly taken in.——A. It was not by the means of lord Bute that my penſion was procured. At the time it was beſtowed on me, Mr. Grenville was miniſter. It was Sir John Philips who intereſted himſelf in my favour; and, on his perſonal application to the king, his majeſty was pleaſed to ſpeak of me in terms too favourable for me to repeat; but which I will, undeviatingly, endeavour to deſerve, by allegiance and by gratitude. I ſay not this, with the leaſt intent to inſinuate that I entertain

the

the ſlighteſt ſuſpicion, had his lordſhip been then the miniſter, that he would have oppoſed his majeſty's bounty towards me. Neither have I ever united, nor will unite, in the malicious, unrelenting and unmerited purſuit of that nobleman. For, by fixing the magiſtracy of the judges during life, by limiting the civil liſt to 800,000*l.* per *annum*, by reducing the profuſion of the houſehold expences, and by concludiug a war, of which a two years farther continuance, would, in all probability, have bankrupted this nation, he proved, that he entered on the miniſtry with a ſincere intention of ſerving, and did ſerve his country. But ſuch was the enormous parliamentary corruption, which the whigs had begun, and cheriſhed, from the revolution to his majeſty's acceſſion to the throne, that, had a bill been then propoſed, in the commons, for their admiſſion into the celeſtial manſions, the majority of them would not have given their votes, without being paid, for this ſalvation of their own ſouls.

That peace, which his enemies have ſo ſcandalouſly decried, is now proved to be of infinite advantage to this kingdom. On that peace the preſent miniſtry have formed that act, which, according to the opinions of the moſt celebrated writers on the polity and government of nations, is the moſt juſt, judicious, and requiſite, that a conquering ſtate can inſtitute, ſince nothing can acquire and preſerve the allegiance of new ſubjects, ſo effectually as permitting them to remain in the ſecure enjoyment of their religion and laws, the former of which was ſtipulated on the capitulation at Quebec. That act has not only fixed the fidelity of thoſe Canadians to their new king; it has eſtabliſhed alſo an ample and ſufficient force to quell the democratic ſpirits of the American

rican ſectaries; in whom rebellion is as naturally inherent, as aliment in food; and who will as certainly manifeſt their regicide diſpoſitions, on all occaſions that may offer, as plants will germinate in the vernal ſeaſon. As to your *ifs*, they ſhall be anſwered, when you can prove there is the leaſt ground for aſking them.

Q. 9th, With what ſhadow of reaſon, can you complain of being treated with ill manners, in the ledger, when you have been ſet upon, though not in the pillory, for abuſing your ſovereign, in the groſſeſt terms?——A. And thus, it ſeems, you conclude that, becauſe I have been ſet on the pillory, for a libel, I have no ſhadow of reaſon to complain of your effrontery, when you treat me as a felon. Would it not be juſt as ſenſible in you to have concluded that, on having been obliged to live one day without food, I could have no ſhadow of reaſon to complain, if it was conſtantly denied me? as to the abuſe of the late king, I have already anſwered that part of your query.

Q. 10th, Inſtead of reviewing the writings of other men, would not your time be more properly employed in a review of your own actions, and a preparation for the grave, to which you are now moſt viſibly haſtening?——A. With reſpect to the reviewing of other men's writings, I am not now engaged in that office; nor ever was I, longer than three months: and even that was more than ſix years ſince. As to the reviewing of my actions, that cannot be your concern. And if your own be as deteſtable, as your heart is evidently black, from theſe queries; take the hint of reviewing and repenting of them alſo: leſt it be, otherwiſe, you fate never to deſcend to a grave

of

of chriſtian burial. For, after this unprovoked deſign, in diſguiſe to ſtab my integrity, can it be a wonder, if you become a real aſſaſſin, are hanged at Tyburn; given to the ſurgeons for diſſection; and your ſkeleton exhibited in a glaſs caſe, with this motto, *peſſimorum peſſimus.*

Q. 11th, Will it not be very complaiſant in you, to anſwer ſuch of theſe queries, as relate to the ſubſcription money, received for your hiſtory of England?——A. I have been more than *very* complaiſant: I have anſwered all the queries. And, I flatter myſelf, to the ſatisfacton of all men, that I am not the villain you would make me; and that I have proved that you deſerve that deteſtation which you intended to heap on me.

Such are my anſwers to the preceding queries. In theſe, he has compelled me to relate many things, which men in general would wiſh to avoid, the laying before the public: but in none have I deviated from truth. And I doubt not, that the diſapprobation of ſo malignant and ſo unprovoked an attack on my character, will prove to be the general ſentiment of thoſe who may read this anſwer.

As I have now both fully and candidly anſwered the queries which this ſubſcriber pronounced with ſuch ſignal *good nature*, I ſhall, in my turn, preſume toaſk him a like number; and call on him for anſwers.

Query 1. Had you received the education of an apothecary, which you affect to deride, would you have talked of *ſtyptics* to *heal*, of *bandages* being *ſold* by *apothecaries*, and of *urinals* as utenſils for women. Would not you have known that the throat does not lead into the thorax; that the

thorax

thorax is not the ſtomach; and therefore does not digeſt; and would not that *breeding* have prevented you from the diſgrace of expoſing yourſelf by ſuch egregious ignorance?

Q. 2. How came *you* to conceive that *aſſes* cannot *bray?* are you void of all *vocal* utterance, or ſo *deaf* that you cannot *hear* yourſelf?

Q. 3. Can your education have exceeded that of a drayman, who have miſtaken the *two* ſacerdotal *orders* for the *thirty nine articles* of the church of England? are you not endowed with moſt conſummate effrontery to accuſe a man of being bred a Jacobite: you, who do not underſtand the difference, between *de jure*, and *de facto*, as applied to kings? or can you be the leaſt judge of literary performances, who have not ideas to the words you uſe?

Q. 4. What right, or what provocation have you to recall the puniſhment I ſuffered, or repeatedly to expoſe me in the Public Ledger, before the eyes of all the Britiſh ſubjects, as ſtanding on the pillory, ſixteen years after I had atoned for the offence?

Q. 5. Are you not the very libeller, which in me you ſo much condemn? do you not deſerve that puniſhment, which, as you ſay, is, to a virtuous character, worſe than death? have you in your queries afforded the minuteſt hint that you are actuated by one ſpark of virtue, ſenſe, or good manners?

Q. 6. In what paſſages of my writings is the late king treated with *foul abuſe*; or the revolution traduced? are you not one of that traiterous gang that is eternally inſulting his preſent majeſty with the moſt flagrant libels?

Q. 7.

Q. 7. Were you really a ſubſcriber, what plauſible motive could you have had to treat me publickly as a felon, acquiring money under falſe pretences, without having previouſly applied to me for anſwers to the ſubject of your queries? have you not aſſumed the ſignature, without being a ſubſcriber, in order to fabricate a pretext for propoſing to me your illiberal queſtions? will you dare to affix your name to them? if you refuſe it, are you not avowedly guilty of a forgery, inexpreſſibly more criminal, than that of ſubſcribing another man's name to a bill, with a view fraudulently to obtain money from the perſon on whom it is drawn? is not integrity more valuable than riches? in juſtice do you not more truly deſerve to die by the hands of the common hangman, for thus endeavouring to rob me of my good name, than if you had been ſeized in burglariouſly breaking into my houſe?

Q. 8. Would not you, who have thus inſidiouſly laboured to ſtab my reputation, have as willingly aſſaſſinated me, could you have accompliſhed it with the like concealment and impunity?

Q. 9. Is not this act of cauſeleſsly invading my reputation an infamy which ought to be branded on your forehead, as a ſtigma to warn mankind from aſſociating with ſo malicious and ſo black a man?

Q. 10. Ought you not to be expelled the ſociety of all eſtimable men, as a *being* peſtilential to the community?

Q. 11. Will it not be as complaiſant in you, is it not as indiſpenſably your duty to anſwer theſe queries, and to ſubſcribe your real name, as it was mine to anſwer yours, and affix my name to that anſwer? unleſs you comply with theſe particulars, do

do you not ſtand ſelf-condemned, and deſerve the univerſal deteſtation of mankind?

I ſhall now leave you to ruminate on what I have written, and to do juſtice to yourſelf, by anſwering, if you can; if not to me, by a full acknowledgement of your flagitious treatment. In the mean while, I ſhall take this opportunity of adverti-ſing the publiſhers of the ledger, and of all other papers, that I will no longer be tamely taken up by them, like an odd man, among the chairmen, when no other is at hand, to ſupply paragraphs of defamation, and fill the meaſure of their ſcurrility, when no other ſubject can be found.

Whatever were my offence, I neither fled from the ſentence of the court, nor have I, from that day to this hour, either in words or writing, attempted to aſperſe the character, or arraign the juſtice of that judge and jury by whom I was tried and found guilty. I knew that greater puniſhments were not unprecedented: and mine I bore without complaining. I was ſoon convinced that nothing of a cruel or vindictive ſpirit poſſeſſed lord Mansfield againſt me. For when my life was in danger, from an ill ſtate of health, and I applied to the court of King's-Bench, for permiſſion to be carried into the rules, a few hours in the day, his lordſhip readily acceded to that petition. This judge Foſter pertinaceouſly denied and defeated. Even ſince the time when the celebrated patriot of the London livery was ſentenced, but to two years impriſonment, and a fine which, to *him*, was nothing, for one offence againſt the government, and three againſt religion, I neither did then, nor do I now complain of the apparent diſparity of offence and infliction between us. It was his peculiar happineſs to be tried, found guilty, and

ſentenced in the reign of our preſent ſovereign, to whom his enemies have imputed even *mercy* as a crime.

Is it not natural to imagine that the being expoſed on the pillory, three years cloſe confinement within the walls of a priſon, together with a fine, might have been deemed a puniſhment adequate to the tranſgreſſion; and ſufficient to ſatisfy the vindictive ſpirit, even of Whigs, and Preſbyterians: more eſpecially, as no man among them has hitherto been able to diſcover, that what I wrote, and for which I ſuffered, was either falſe, malicious, or ſeditious? Nor did it relate to the private actions of any man, but to the public and national proceedings of miniſters, with which the people have a claim to be acquainted, when they are deſtructive of their happineſs and welfare. And I may aver, with the ſtricteſt veracity, that the letters which were written to the people of England, contributed not a little towards creating the popularity, and thereby to the elevation of lord Chatham to the ſeat of prime miniſter. To him, his enemies acknowledge this nation is indebted, for the happy change of their affairs, on his admiſſion to the conduct of them. Why then are my endeavours, to that end, entirely buried in oblivion; my offence and my puniſhment inceſſantly remembered?

Even againſt the diſcarded miniſters, who ſo relentleſsly purſued me, I never have complained. Men in power, place, and profit, are naturally vindictive, and feel the loſs of them with inexpreſſible reſentment; and not the leſs, becauſe the allegations which are brought againſt them are indiſputably true. Such being the conditions of their being men, whatever were my ſufferings, however ſeverely they were inflicted, I have, at no time,

time, ſince the day of my commitment to priſon, written one word againſt them. They are now dead, and peace be to their manes.

It is lord Chatham only of whom I have reaſon to complain; who having profited by my writings, and having publickly declared, that he avowed the truth of all that they contained; in return for my endeavours to ſerve him, after he was mounted above the throne, and poſſeſſed of abſolute power, not only permitted me to be puniſhed for writing words leſs offenſive than he had repeatedly ſpoken in the houſe of commons; but even ill treated Sir John Philipps, who applied to him in my favour.

Such being the true ſtate, reſpecting me and my puniſhment, on what pretext, after the expiration of ſixteen years, from the time of my offence, am I to be thus undeſervedly treated by thoſe whoſe talents ariſe not to the knowledge either of the ſubject, or the language in which they write; who in ambuſcade ſo inſidiouſly attack me on all occaſions? why is my tranſgreſſion never to be forgotten, and my puniſhment to know no bounds? why do they return to old tranſactions for new abuſe; and continually expoſe me on the pillory for that which I have already attoned by my ſufferings? for, is it not as equally a puniſhment to be expoſed in news-papers to the millions of my fellow-ſubjects, as at Charing-Croſs, to a few hundreds? and would not theſe remorſeleſs miſcreants, who thus treat my name in their publications, as readily bring me in perſon to the pillory, could it be done with equal impunity. Of ſuch anonymous and abuſive writers I ſhall henceforth take no notice; but leave them in their garrets to their lice.

But although theſe writers are contemptible, nameleſs and inſcrutable, their publiſhers are not. And I would have theſe gentlemen be aſſured, that I will no longer be made their property of abuſe: and if any thing be hereafter inſerted, without the name of the writer, and their being poſſeſſed of ſufficient evidence to prove who he is, that I will ſeek from them that redreſs, to which by law I am entitled; and no longer remain ſupinely inattentive to ſuch publications as are illegal. Full ſixteen years I have been the cauſeleſs object of their malediction and calumny, without reſentment or reply. They have now extended their malevolence to my ſon. And, if they ſhall be ſtill indulged in this illiberal proceeding, they may, at length, plead preſcription; and their ſucceſſors in ſcandal perſevere with impunity, not only to revile me, but all that may be defcended from me. And to this admonition I expect they will pay a due attention.

Having now done with nameleſs and abuſive writers, and with news-paper publiſhers, I ſhall embrace this occaſion of conveying my ſentiments to a pair of gentlemen who, in ſpeeches, ſince publiſhed, have been pleaſed to traduce me, without the leaſt provocation. Theſe are two Orators, of *prodigious merit*, the right hon. Tommy Townſhend, and the right learned Counſellor Lee. The former of theſe is thus characteriſed in the St. James's Chronicle of July the 30th, by a writer who aſſumes the ſignature of *Clio*: and therefore, *muſa majora canamus*.

" The right honourable Thomas Townſhend is one of the moſt reſpectable members that ſit in the houſe. Though he is wanting in fluency of expreſſion; yet the ſoundneſs of his ſenſe, the ſpirit of

of conduct, the integrity of his character, and the vehemence of his manner, render him, upon the whole, one of the moſt formidable members in oppoſition." To the integrity of his character I have nothing to object; for I know nothing of it. The ſoundneſs of his ſenſe and the ſpirit of his conduct, I ſhall beg leave to examine. At the ſame time, I acknowledge the "vehemence of his manner," does render him one of the moſt formidable members in oppoſition; for, in his ſpeaking, he ſeems as if he were going to *bite*.

Clio continues, "his eloquence, when he happens to be fluent, which he ſometimes is, has a greater effect than that of any man in the houſe; for the ſpirit, the fire, with which he attacks a miniſter, or a meaſure, is commanding: he throws his objections in the ſtrongeſt light poſſible, and is *unmerciful* in the concluſions he draws from evil doings." A very butcher of an orator. "In his connections and ſpeeches, he is remarkable for his true old Whiggiſh principles; and his abhorrence of the meaſures, which brought in Tories and Jacobites." Ever ſince he hath been diſmiſſed from his places and profits. Clio proceeds, "his ſpeech on the penſions, given to doctors Shebbeare and Johnſon, and the countenance ſhewn to Sir John Dalrymple, for having vilified the memory of lord Ruſſel, and the great Sydney, was a performance, which will not be ſoon forgiven at St. James's." Which, if it be true, is no great proof of the ſoundneſs of his ſenſe. However, that ſpeech "had prodigious merit, and was greatly received. Lord North attempted to anſwer it, but failed." Nevertheleſs, I will undertake to attempt that in which, as Clio ſays, the prime miniſter miſcarried. "The channel in which the patronage

tronage of the preſent reign flows, is a never-failing topic with him.'! He is no longer in that channel. "And he cuts it up with great ſpirit, wit, and as little mercy." With much more mercy, ſmall as it is, than ſpirit, or wit, I aſſure you. And is not *cutting* up a *channel* moſt happily metaphorical?

And now, ſays Clio, "whenever a change in the miniſtry happens, he is expected to fill one of the higheſt poſts in adminiſtration; and he will fill it with credit to himſelf, and advantage to the kingdom." From a compariſon of this character with the ſpeech above alluded to, and printed in the London Packet of the 18th of February, I cannot but conclude, they are the productions of the ſame genius. And this character intended as an election puff, to exhibit his talents and his conſequence to the univerſity of Cambridge, of which he is the repreſentative. Be that as it may, I humbly preſume to offer a different reading of the laſt paſſage in his character; and to ſuppoſe Mr. Townſhend ſpeaking in the firſt perſon. "Whenever a change in the miniſtry happens, I expect to fill one of the higheſt poſts in adminiſtration: and I will fill it with *profit* to myſelf, whatever the *advantage* may be to the kingdom."

The character being diſpatched, I come now to the ſpeech itſelf, of ſuch prodigious merit, and ſo greatly received, that lord North failed in anſwering it. It was ſpoken in oppoſition to a motion made in the houſe of commons, for proſecuting the printers of a paper that appeared in the Public Advertiſer and Morning Chronicle, of the 16th of February, ſigned a South Briton. "I cannot forbear, ſays he, remarking, on the induſtry and pains employed to paint the offence now ſtated to you in the moſt aggravated colours, when the very perſons,

perſons, who not only condemned the revolution, which is the thing brought againſt the pitiful author of the libel, now before you, but who reviled the prince on the throne, and endeavoured to overturn the conſtitution and the laws, are now publicly careſſed and penſioned. The men I mean are, Dr. Shebbeare and Dr. Johnſon. I have no perſonal knowledge of either of them; but I am well informed, that Shebbeare has a penſion, and that Johnſon's has been doubled ſince he wrote a certain pamphlet, in which every prince, ſince the revolution, but his preſent majeſty, has been moſt infamouſly and ſcandalouſly traduced. Are theſe then the men that are to be taken into the boſom of adminiſtration, in order to be rewarded for offences little ſhort of treaſon; and is a poor wretched printer or obſcure ſcribler to feel the full force of our indignation for a crime however reprehenſible in itſelf, when compared with thoſe which I have mentioned ſcarcely worthy of our notice? there are ſome perſons, near me, deſcendants of the illuſtrious Ruſſel; and I have myſelf, a drop of the blood of Sydney in me. I muſt confeſs, I cannot therefore ſit ſilent and hear the reſentments of this houſe poured upon an inſignificant printer, at the inſtigation of thoſe who countenance, protect, and encourage the men who have attempted, in the moſt cool and deliberate manner, to revile that revolution, to which thoſe heroes ſo glorioufly paved the way."

I ſhall now examine into the *prodigious merit* of this exhibition of oratoric excellence, the ſound ſenſe, and ſpirit of conduct of this moſt formidable member in the oppoſition, concluding that on this occaſion he was fluent. There are various qualifications, both in the ſpeaker and the ſpeech, that

that are indiſpenſibly requiſite to conſtitute the former an *orator*, and the latter an *oration*. Among theſe, conſiſtency of character, truth, and ſentiments coinciding, through the whole, and conducive to the ſame purpoſe, to ſay nothing of the energy of ſtyle, propriety of expreſſion, and powers of elocution. Among the excellencies of this formidable ſpeaker, enumerated in the preceding character, this is one, "that he is remarkable for his true old Whiggiſh principles." And, as an evidence of this truth, he gets up, denominates the paper before them a *libel* againſt the *revolution*; and declares, he cannot ſit ſilent, and hear the reſentments of the houſe poured upon an inſignificant printer, who, as he allows, had publiſhed a libel againſt the *revolution*. This, I apprehend, is the very perfection of conſiſtency; an old Whig ſtyles a paper before him, a *libel* againſt the *revolution*. He then harangues in *favour* of the perſons who printed this *libel*, with intent to avert the indignation of the houſe; and this becauſe he cannot ſit ſilent and hear the reſentment of that houſe, from men who *countenance* and *protect* thoſe *who have reviled the revolution*. And yet, this countenance and protection is that very tranſgreſſion which he himſelf is at that moment committing, in defence of the printer, who he himſelf has denominated to be a like reviler of that revolution. Does not this ſpirited conduct, and conſiſtency of principle, evince the ſoundneſs of his ſenſe, and confirm "that there is ſomething in his character very *ſtriking?*"

Let me now enquire into his reaſons for ſpeaking on this occaſion. And theſe are, "that he cannot forbear remarking, on the *induſtry* and pains employed to *paint* the offence now *ſtated* in the moſt

aggravated

aggravated colours." This paſſage, I am apprehenſive, contains ſome particulars, that neither Ariſtotle, nor Quintilian have enumerated among thoſe qualities in an oration, that pronounce a man to be a moſt reſpectable ſpeaker. Do painters *ſtate* an offence, or orators *paint* a *ſtate* of it? and if they do, ſhould it not be in the moſt aggravated *colouring*, to preſerve the metaphor, and make it conſiſtent with common ſenſe and common Engliſh? will this paſs muſter at Cambridge?

Having, in this manner, given his reaſons for remarking on the *induſtry* and *pains* of *painting* a *ſtated* offence, he now proceeds to deliver thoſe, which are full as good, for averting the indignation of the houſe from the author or publiſher of the paper, which he denominates a *libel*. And theſe are the pitifulneſs of the obſcure ſcribler, and the poverty and wretchedneſs of the printer. Now, unleſs this orator be acquainted with this obſcure ſcribler, by what means does he know that he is a pitiful author? it is true, indeed, if he beſtow that epithet on him, on account of the manner in which that paper is written, the author of it is pitiful enough. And if we may determine from the *ſpeaking* of an orator, what will prove to be the pitifulneſs of his *writing*, and that characteriſtic is to be received as his protection from puniſhment, the right honourable gentleman may ſafely commence his *written* libels, whenever he will, and defy the indignation of the houſe. At the ſame time, it may not prove to be an evidence of the ſoundneſs of his ſenſe, abſolutely to confide in that pitifulneſs for his ſecurity. Becauſe, I apprehend, the law does not pay ſo much attention to the pitifulneſs of the performance, as to the maliciouſneſs and miſchief of the intention in the writer. And then, if he be as vehement and as contemptible

in

in writing, as he is in ſpeaking, he may chance to be as much derided as an author, as he is as an orator, and to be puniſhed for putting on paper, thoſe very words, which, in the houſe, he ſpeaks with impunity. For it ſeems the good manners and liberty of ſpeech, allowable in that place, make that inoffenſive, which the law condemns as a libel in all others. So much would not have been ſaid on this head, had the author of the South Briton been known.

With relation to the printers, I ſincerely wiſh their poorneſs and wretchedneſs may tend to alleviate their ſentence. For it would ſeem to be hard for them to ſuffer greatly for printing ſo pitiful a performance. I hope, therefore, their puniſhment may prove as lenient as the laws can allow, and mercy dictate. For it uniformly appears that the ſeverity of infliction, in ſuch caſes, like burning at a ſtake for hereſy, rather increaſes the number of converts, than intimidates from tranſgreſſion. And as theſe pitiful ſcriblers againſt government, have either already committed, or are in the actual commiſſion of a literary ſelf-murder, I could wiſh to ſee them proceed with as little interruption as poſſible, till, by their writings, they render themſelves incapable of making converts, to their cauſe; and expire by their own handy-work; and in that manner put an end to writing and printing ſuch miſerable productions.

There is yet another reaſon which this right honourable ſpeaker is pleaſed to offer, in order to avert the indignation of the houſe of commons. It is that "Johnſon and Shebbeare are now publickly careſſed and penſioned, who have not only condemned the revolution, but have reviled the prince on the throne; have endeavoured to overturn the conſtitution and the laws; and committed

offences

offences little ſhort of treaſon." Now I do not perceive, why this moſt reſpectable orator ſhould be ſo vehemently declamatory; nor on what he can ground his malediction of the miniſtry, for penſioning Dr. Johnſon and myſelf; ſince we have done, if he may be credited, the ſame things only for which he is labouring to obtain an alleviation of reſentment againſt the printers of the South Briton? if ſo obſcure a ſcribler, deſerve to eſcape from puniſhment, for ſo pitiful a performance, does it not logically follow, that we ought to be rewarded for having executed ſuch magnificent undertakings in the ſame way?

However, neither Dr. Johnſon nor myſelf ſhall preſume to avail ourſelves of this argument. On the contrary, we defy this moſt reſpectable member of ſound ſenſe to adduce one inſtance, in proof, that either of us hath endeavoured to overturn the conſtitution and the laws, hath written a word againſt the revolution, againſt the religion of our country, or even to the prejudice of morality and good manners. And, if we had approached as nearly to treaſon as he has to falſehood, in this charge againſt us, I am afraid we ſhould deſerve as much to be put to death for what we have written, as he does, *not* to be credited for what he hath ſpoken, and then the Lord have mercy upon us.

But he ſays, "we have reviled the prince on the throne." According to the context with the preceding part of the ſentence, which mentions the revolution, this prince on the throne muſt be king William, who was dead ten years before either of us was born. And this ſeems to make it ſomewhat difficult to reconcile that paſſage with common ſenſe. Since it cannot be king William, it

muſt

muſt be his preſent majeſty, who is the prince on the throne, whom we have reviled. But this ſuppoſition cannot ſerve him either; becauſe he declares, that Dr. Johnſon hath traduced every prince ſince the revolution, *except* his majeſty: and of that offence, reſpecting me, he ſays nothing. But, conſidering the prodigious merits of this ſpeech, although the orator *except* his majeſty, I am not perfectly convinced that he does *not mean* him. Now, unleſs this formidable member will explain in what manner we reviled king William on the throne, who was dead before we were born; or how we can have reviled the prince *on* the throne, and yet *not* have reviled his *preſent* majeſty, which he allows we have not, I ſhall never enjoy ſound ſenſe enough to comprehend it. And if an explanation be attempted, it muſt come from him, or no attention will be paid to it. This I deſire to have conſidered, not only as an inſtance of his adherence to truth, but of his conſiſtency in matter alſo.

The orator riſes in ſublimity, and ſpeaking of the *libel*, as he calls it, by way of ſoftening the indignation of the houſe, he ſays, "a crime, however reprehenſible in itſelf, when compared with thoſe, which he has now mentioned, ſcarcely worthy of their notice." Theſe words are too elevated, for the reach of my comprehenſion. I do not conceive in what manner a crime can be, *however*, or in whatever degree, reprehenſible, and nevertheleſs, by compariſon with another, become ſcarcely worthy of notice. Suppoſe, for example, the degree of criminality had mounted to treaſon, which is one among the *howevers*, *would* it have been reduced to a degree unworthy of notice, on being compared with thoſe of Dr. Johnſon and myſelf? which latter, as this moſt formidable member

ber has the goodneſs to grant, are "a *little ſhort of treaſon?*" might it not as juſtly be ſaid, in whatever degree a cloth be black, the blackeſt, for example, that it is ſcarcely black, when compared with another, that is not quite ſo black? and then the *unmerciful* concluſion muſt logically be, that the piece leſs black, is *blacker* than the *blackeſt*.

This right honourable and moſt reſpectable member, however, diſclaims, "all perſonal knowledge of either of us." For myſelf, I aſſure him, that the ſoundneſs of his ſenſe, his prodigious merit, and his adherence to truth, have not created in me the leaſt deſire of being better acquainted with him. He then ſays, "he is well informed I have a penſion." And for once he is not miſtaken. "And that Dr. Johnſon's has been doubled ſince he wrote the pamphlet," above alluded to. I wiſh he may be as well informed in that particular as in the preceding. And that ſome one could *truly* inform him alſo, that mine will be doubled, for writing this pamplet. And in return, let the ſoundneſs of his ſenſe, the vehemence of his manner, and the formidableneſs of his oppoſition be trebled. Let him let looſe his malediction, with its beſt fluency, on me, and I ſhall not be apprehenſive of being overwhelmed by that torrent. At length, he aſks this queſtion. "Are theſe then the men that are to be taken into the boſom of adminiſtration, in order to be rewarded?" Whether Dr. Johnſon be taken into that *boſom* or not, I know not; but as his penſion is doubled, I expect lord North will take me into the *breeches pocket* of adminiſtration, and that ſhall content me.

I am now come to that ſplendid Apoſtrophe, intended for Sir John Dalrymple, which, it ſeems, will

will not ſoon be forgiven at St. James's. "There are, ſays he, ſome perſons near me, deſcendants of the illuſtrious Sydney, and I have myſelf a drop of the Ruſſel blood in me." And what do theſe two wonderful circumſtances produce in him? they ſend him to confeſſion. "I confeſs, ſays he, I cannot therefore, ſit ſilent and hear the reſentment of this houſe poured upon an inſignificant printer, at the inſtigation of thoſe who countenance, protect and encourage the men, who have attempted, in the moſt cool and deliberate manner, to revile that revolution to which thoſe heroes ſo glorioufly paved the way." He cannot ſit ſilent and hear the reſentments of the houſe poured on an inſignificant printer; but he muſt exert his oratory in his favour; becauſe the miniſtry, I ſuppoſe, have countenanced, protected and encouraged Sir John Dalrymple, who has *attempted* to revile that revolution, to which thoſe heroes ſo glorioufly paved the way. And thus this local proximity of Ruſſel deſcendants, and one drop of Sydney blood, have compelled him into an abſurdity unexampled. He hath poured forth his vehemence againſt the miniſtry, for their countenance of one who has only *attempted* to revile the revolution, in favour of another, who as he has acknowledged, hath *actually* reviled that very revolution, in a *libel* before them. I take the force of argument, and the *unmercifulneſs of the concluſion* to be extremely tranſcendant in this inſtance.

But there is yet another circumſtance ſingularly remarkable in this paſſage. This member of ſound ſenſe, is miſtaken in the matter of fact. For Sir John Dalrymple hath not attempted to revile the revolution, nor to defame thoſe heroes, who may as juſtly be ſaid to have glorioufly paved the way to the new Jeruſalem, as to the revolution. But let

Sir

Sir John defend himſelf, reſpecting his treatment of the revolution. As to Ruſſel and Sydney, he ſtands forth, in his Memoirs, their conſpicuous panegyriſt. It muſt be allowed, indeed, that he has adopted a new mode of *verifying* facts in hiſtory, by bringing indiſputable authorities to diſprove the *truth* of them. And now I would adviſe this formidable orator to let that *drop* of *Sydney* blood out of his veins, if it have not already corrupted the whole maſs.—" It is a general rule, ſays Mr. Bayes, that you muſt ever make a *ſimile* when you are ſurpriſed," Now, as I am doubly ſurpriſed, on this occaſion, before I proceed to offer my reaſons, for adviſing this moſt formidable member in oppoſition to let out this Sydney drop, I ſhall explain the two *ſurprizes*, and then bring two *ſimiles*.

Firſt ſurprize. That an orator ſo reſpectable, of ſuch ſound ſenſe, ſo formidable in oppoſition to the miniſtry, with all the other great talents and qualifications mentioned in his character, ſhould make ſuch a ſpeech as the preceding.

Second ſurprize. That any man, who had heard that ſpeech, could have conceived the orator to be a perſon of ſuch prodigious merit, ſpirit, wit, eloquence, &c. even when he is fluent.

Theſe ſingular phænomena may receive a full explanation, by the ſole circumſtance of ſuppoſing the ſpeaker and the panegyriſt to be the ſame perſon; and then the ſurprizes ceaſe. However that may be, I am nevertheleſs reſolved that my readers and the right honourable gentleman ſhall have the two ſimiles.

Firſt ſimile. If you put a calf's head in a pot and ſet it on the fire, with the cover on, you will find, by degrees, that the heat below raiſes the ſcum

ſcum to the ſurface, ſets the pot a boiling, and drives that ſcum, with a blubbering impetuoſity, which ſtruggles for an exploſion, between the pot-lid and the pot; then thick and filthy it creeps down the ſooty ſides of it. In this caſe, the formidableneſs ariſes from the danger of being ſcalded, if we approach too near the vehemence of the ſpluttering utenſil. This I take be a pretty exact reſemblance of the unmerciful orator, when he is *not* fluent.

Second ſimile. If you place a barrel of new ſmall beer on a dray, by the agitation of the vehicle, the fermentation vaſtly encreaſes, the dregs riſe to the top, and the vehemence of the working will ſplit the caſk, unleſs you open the vent; then out ſprings the foaming, turbid, ſpiritleſs liquor, riſes prodigiouſly into the ſublime, exhauſts its friſky force, and on the veſſel's ſides flows ſwiftly down. In this caſe, the formidableneſs ariſes from the danger of being horribly beſpattered if you approach too near the caſk. This I take to be the true reſemblance of this reſpectable orator, when he *is* fluent.

When the colonel, in the Committee, bids Teague to carry a meſſage to Mrs. Day, who had been his father's cook-maid, the Iriſhman tells his maſter that, on the ſight of her, the pots and the ſpits will come into his head, and the laugh upon his face, againſt which the colonel gives him the ſtrongeſt injunction. In like manner, when this unmerciful orator ſhall again harangue the houſe, I warn the commons neither to let the *pot* nor the *ſmall beer barrel* to come into their heads, nor the laugh on their faces: But to behave with all due decorum to ſo *reſpectable* a member.

And

And now, having anſwered this ſpeaker, of old whiggiſh principles, of ſound ſenſe, ſpirited conduct, vehement manner, and formidableneſs in oppoſition; of ſtriking character, the ready advocate for enlarged and general meaſures; and the patron of madhouſes; I muſt acknowledge in the laſt he affords a ſtriking inſtance of diſintereſtedneſs; ſince, from thence, he has no advantage to expect, being in no more danger of loſing his underſtanding, than a perſon is of being robbed, who has nothing to loſe.

Clamabit vacuus coram doctore orator.

Beſides the preceding excellences, he is the ſoul of oppoſition; has great eloquence, when he is fluent; more effectual, fiery, ſpirited and commanding, in attacking a miniſter, than any man; he is an unmerciful old Wig, and abhorrer of Tories and Jacobites; an orator of prodigious merit, great ſpirit, wit, and as little mercy; whom lord North attempted to anſwer, but failed. Such and ſo formidable being the man, whom I have engaged, I ſhall, in imitation of Sir John Falſtaffe, to the prince of Wales, after he had *killed* a *dead* Percy, preſume to tell his lordſhip, "that if he do me juſtice ſo; if not, let him demoliſh the next unmerciful Tommy Townſhend himſelf. I look either to have my penſion doubled, or a good place, I can aſſure him."

Having diſpatched my animadverſions, ſurprizes, and ſimiles, I ſhall now proceed to aſſign my reaſons for adviſing the right honourable orator to let that drop of Sydney blood out of his veins. And to this intent, I ſhall endeavour to give a faithful portrait of this glorious hero, Algernon Sydney; a drop of whoſe ſacred blood, like a ſaint's relique,

is ſo much adored by him. And firſt, of his political principles, in civil inſtitutions *. He was a zealous republican, who upheld the magiſtracy, and the miniſtry, without a ſingle perſon, kingſhip, or houſe of lords. In his religious eſtabliſhment, he was averſe from the church of England, her doctrines, diſcipline, rites and ceremonies; an enemy to epiſcopacy, and to all degrees of dignity in eccleſiaſtical polity. As a neceſſary conſequence of theſe principles, he was an avowed enemy to the conſtitution of this kingdom, which the orator not only affects to admire and eſteem, but to abhor thoſe alſo, who, as he ſays, have endeavoured to overturn it. He held that kings were the truſtees of, and derived their authority from the people; that the people are the ſole judges of their regal government; have a right to take arms; to dethrone their ſovereigns, to change the conſtitution both in church and ſtate; and that the *king*, being a politic perſon, unleſs he be deſtroyed in his natural capacity, it is not high treaſon.

In obedience to theſe principles, he took arms, and engaged in the grand rebellion againſt Charles the firſt; in which it does not appear that he ſignalized himſelf by any conſpicuous action. He was zealous and active, in all the prepoſterous changes, eccleſiaſtical and civil, of theſe times, till Cromwell aſſumed the ſole government of the kingdom; and he vehemently oppoſed Richard, after Oliver's death. At this time, unaltered in opinion, by the long experience of that anarchy and deſpotiſm, which ſubſiſted under the various forms that government received, and which demonſtrated the madneſs of expecting liberty from principles

* Life of Sydney, p. 5, his diſcourſes, paſſim.

ciples ſo abſurd and impracticable. Inſtigated by the ſame pertinaciouſneſs of democratic fury, and preſbyterian fanaticiſm, he united with *Praiſegod Barebones*, and his rump, under a ſolemn obligation to accompliſh the excluſion of kings, protectors, nobles and the church of England.

At the reſtoration, he was excepted amongſt the regicides, as a man incompatible by his hatred to the conſtitution, and as irreconcileable to a king in allegiance by any acts of kindneſs. On his ſolicitation to Henry Saville, ambaſſador in France, to interfere in procuring him liberty to return to England, he was ſuffered to reviſit his native land; and obtained his pardon from Charles the ſecond. Notwithſtanding this act of mercy, in the king, and without his having performed a ſingle act, during his exile, which might merit this forgiveneſs, he immediately became a traitor to that very prince; and an agent of the king of France, in order to promote the deſigns of that monarch, and to oppoſe thoſe of his lawful ſovereign. And to this flagitious purpoſe he was purchaſed by a penſion, paid him by Barillon, the French ambaſſador at the court of England. This treachery, which was ſuſpected during his life, hath been lately verified by indiſputable authorities, taken from the letters of Barillon, preſerved in the proper place of depoſiting ſuch records in France. And in a letter of Sydney to Henry Saville, who, like him, was a republican, and a traitor to his maſter, it is ſo far confirmed as to ſhew, that both *Sydney* and *Saville* were ſecretly intriguing with the French court, againſt their ſovereign: for in that letter he ſays, * "*you know Monſieur de Barillon governs us if, he be not miſtaken.*" Let the man who glories in

 having

* Sydney's letter to Saville, p. 45.

having one drop of Sydney blood in him, explain this paſſage to any purpoſe but the former, if he can.

Not ſatisfied with this treachery and ingratitude to the king, whoſe lawful authority he acknowledged, by accepting pardon and life from his hands, he, with the lords Shaftſbury, Ruſſel, and others, became the patrons and abettors of the enormous perjuries of Titus Oates, reſpecting a Popiſh plot againſt the king's life. The moſt groundleſs, malicious, and inhuman machination, that ever villains invented or ſupported. By this infernal fiction not leſs than twenty men, entirely innocent of the charge, periſhed by the hands of the public executioner; among whom was the aged and virtuous lord Stafford. This nefariouſneſs being accompliſhed, Sydney, with the lords Ruſſel, Eſſex, Howard, Grey, together with Sir Thomas Armſtrong, Ferguſon the Preſbyterian teacher, Rumſey, Rumbold, Nelthorpe, Wade, Goodenough, Walcot, Thomſon, Burton, Hone, and a few more, preſumed themſelves to be the people of England; pronounced that the king had, by his maladminiſtration, forfeited his right to reign; and therefore, that it was lawful to dethrone him by any means whatever. And, with that intent, they entered into a conſpiracy to take arms, and to aſſaſſinate their ſovereign. Such were the natural effects of thoſe principles which theſe men eſpouſed. And is there not ſomething ſimilar that ſeems to prevail, at preſent? do not the aldermen Wilkes, Croſby, Bull, and Sir Watkin Lewes, together with the bill of rights men; the aldermen Sawbridge, Townſhend, Oliver, Catharine Macauley, and the conſtitutional ſociety; together with a majority of the common-council, the livery of London, and the mob of Newcaſtle,

the

the men of tender conſcience, and the Antiarticularians of the Feathers Tavern, preſume to be the whole people of England at this day? and as their principles are the ſame with republicans and regicides is it not neceſſary to be watchful of their actions?

The plot being diſcovered, Sydney was apprehended, tried, found guilty, and beheaded. And although the law may have been unjuſtly ſtrained, in converting the papers, which were found in his cloſet, to a ſecond evidence againſt him, becauſe this proof, the crime of high treaſon undoubtedly demands: and which can never be violated, but by the outrage of an unmerciful and unjuſt judge. And altho' Sydney were not lawfully put to death, yet is there a man, now living, who believes he was not engaged in this conſpiracy, to take away the life of that king, who gave *him* his, and therefore that he deſerved his fate? perſons of upright hearts will moſt certainly condemn and deteſt the magiſtrate; but can that violence, on one ſide, exculpate the criminality on the other? was Sydney in fact the *more* to be pitied as a traitor, becauſe he ſuffered by the ſentence of the unjuſt and cruel Jefferies? And permit me to aſk, that, ſince no argument can palliate this illegal execution, even of a guilty man, what have the Whigs of king William's reign to offer in their excuſe, who, through deficiency of a ſecond witneſs, made an expreſs law of attainder, to put Sir John Fenwick to death; againſt whom nothing can be ſaid, that will not be equally applicable to Algernon Sydney.

Such was this heroic Sydney, by principle, a republican; by practice, a rebel; by intention, a regicide; and, in all, a fanatic viſionary. His doctrine, reſpecting the right of the people to oppoſe their ſovereigns in arms, to judge, depoſe, and

and put them to death, if they be ſuſtainable in any ſtate; and on the utmoſt emergencies; are ſuch as are the moſt cauſeleſsly promulged in this kingdom. For, by this conſtitution, the miniſter is anſwerable for the conduct of public affairs, the people have their repreſentatives, and they are, by their duty and their office, obliged to ſuperintend the adminiſtration of the realm. They are the grand inqueſt of the kingdom, and bound to impeach the perpetrators of national miſchief. The lords are the higheſt court of juſtice, before whom miniſterial offenders are legally to be brought: and it is their duty to try, to acquit, or to find them guilty. And laſtly, the king has the power of life and death, to pardon or to confirm the ſentence.

Hence it is evident, that, in all caſes of public malverſation, the people have, at firſt, a right only to apply to their repreſentatives for redreſs of grievances. If they neglect their duty, it is againſt them, who are their ſervants, that reſentment ought to be exerted. But if theſe impeach the miniſter, before the houſe of lords, and the latter refuſe or evade the claims of juſtice; it is againſt them the people have then their right of manifeſting their indignation. If this high tribunal acquit the impeached miniſter, there the affair muſt legally reſt. If they find him guilty, and the king refuſe to ſign his ſentence, or pardon him unmeriting it; then, and then only, the people can claim the leaſt right of appealing to their ſovereign, in ſearch of juſtice; when if it be refuſed, and the cauſe be worthy of ſuch purſuit, they may ſeek redreſs by thoſe means which God has given them.

But in all ſuch caſes, nothing but a certain majority of the people can properly apply to their repreſentatives; and a majority of their repreſentatives

to

to the houſe of lords; a denial of juſtice, on their part, can alone vindicate the people in ſeeking from them redreſs; and then on that of the ſovereign, before the people can juſtifiably take arms againſt him.

And now we can aſcertain by what means that hero, ſo glorioufly paved the way to the revolution. By rebelling againſt Charles the firſt; ſubverting the conſtitution in church and ſtate; and approving the murder of that ſovereign. By engaging with the rump parliament, to govern without a king or houſe of lords. By becoming the penſioned traitor of Lewis the fourteenth; and entering into a conſpiracy againſt the *life* of that king, who had given him *his*. By being tried, found guilty, and executed for rebellion. Such is the hero and couſin of the reſpectable member; ſuch are the deeds for which he ſtiles him glorious. And theſe, I ſhould think, can form but a ſcurvy pavement to the revolution. Are theſe the true old whiggiſh principles alſo, for which he is remarkable? and let me tell this couſin Tommy, that his hero ſeems to have entertained no favourable opinion, either of the intentions or abilities of King William. For, in a letter to Saville, p. 46, he ſays, "I long ſince found that the deſign of ſending H. Sydney into Holland, was like the reſt of Sir William Temple's projects; a matter of great depth, and kept ſo cloſe, that not one of them would ſpeak to me of it: but this day was a ſe'ennight, a gentleman that came to ſee me, took a letter out of his pocket, newly come from Holland, wherein the whole end of his negotiation is ſet out very plainly; which, in ſhort, is underſtood to be no more, than under a pretence of a guaranty, to draw Holland and Spain into a league with England; which may help

help the prince of Orange with an occaſion of breaking the peace lately made; which, I believe, will take effect, if the *French* can be perſuaded to *ſleep* three months, and take no notice of it; if the Loveſtein party, in Holland, and their aſſociates, can be brought to *believe* the prince of Orange thinks of advancing *no intereſt but the public good of his country*, and if our houſe of commons can be ſo well ſatisfied with the *management* of the *laſt buſineſs* in Flanders, as to be willing to raiſe a new army, under the *ſame conduct*; and to believe one that is ſo raiſed, will conduce to the defence of Flanders as much as the laſt."

From this opinion of the prince of Orange, conjoined with the democratic fanaticiſm of Sydney, does it not appear extremely probable, that if he intended to pave the way to a revolution, it was of a different kind from that of placing king William on the throne of theſe realms? for ſuch was the temper of all thoſe implacable contenders for liberty, that, when once they had riſen above the lawful authority of the king, by the arms of an infatuated populace, they never imagined themſelves in real liberty, till thoſe very people were ſubdued to an impracticability of oppoſing them. In this manner, theſe ſearchers of the lord and liberty, obtained an aſcendant over one another, as the preſbyterian and the independent rebels occaſionally prevailed, till abſolute power, in order to obtain an abſolute freedom, for himſelf alone, centered in Oliver Cromwel; and that the ſoul of Sydney was of the ſame form is evidently ſeen in Thurloe's memoirs. Such was the *heroic* Algernon, one drop of whoſe blood the unmerciful Tommy Townſhend ſo much eſteems. On this account, will not that right honourable gentleman exhibit a ſtronger indication

of

of ſound ſenſe and ſpirited conduct, in letting out, than preſerving, that rebellious drop? and when he charged Dr. Johnſon and me with endeavouring to overturn the conſtitution, and the laws; and with offences little ſhort of treaſon; did he not deviate into the moſt flagrant inconſiſtency, to value his conſanguinity with Algernon Sydney, whom he denominates a glorious hero, for having perpetrated crimes egregiouſly more enormous than thoſe of which he falſely accuſes us? does this abſurdity, in that formidable orator, ſpring from ſheer ignorance? or from what motive, whilſt he is labouring to repreſent *us* to *be little* leſs than traitors, does he eſtimate himſelf ſo highly for his alliance with Algernon Sydney, than whom no hiſtory has yet produced a more ſanguinary and ungrateful *traitor*; not to his ſovereigns only, but to the conſtitution of his country alſo? does not this condemnation of Dr. Johnſon and myſelf originate in his boſom, becauſe we have ſhewn our allegiance and duty to his preſent majeſty, by our writings; and the ſenſeleſs effuſion of his panegyric proceed from the like principles, which actuated the rebel heart of his heroic couſin Sydney?

I have now done with this moſt reſpectable member, and his Sydney drop. I ſhall now proceed to examine the ſpeech of counſellor Lee, a gentleman in whom the niceſt balance cannot determine whether modeſty or argument do moſt preponderate. This ſpeech was inſerted in the Public Ledger, the 12th of July, and delivered on the trial of the printers for that very paper which engendered that very ſpeech of *prodigious merit*, which bluſtered from the oratoric lips of the formidable ſpeaker, already mentioned. We all know that a dog will return to his *own* vomit, but not

not to that of *another*. On this occaſion, this learned and modeſt advocate returns to lick up the filthy ſcum, or foaming muddy and ſpiritleſs ſmall beer that fell from the moſt reſpectable orator, and ſpews it out once more in defence of the ſame printers, in a ſecond ſpeech of equally prodigious merit. Among others, he is pleaſed to favour me with one ſhort paſſage of his matchleſs harangue. " Such a fellow as Shebbeare, after groſsly traducing the moſt illuſtrious character of the age, and reviling in almoſt direct terms, the revolution, he we find rewarded with a penſion." Now I am really at a loſs, to comprehend whom he intends by that deſcription of *the moſt illuſtrious character of the age:* and, therefore, until he ſhall be pleaſed to name the perſon, and prove him to be that illuſtrious character, I ſhall not attempt to vindicate myſelf from the charge of traducing him. But what *ſuch a fellow* as Lee can mean, by my reviling, in almoſt direct terms, the revolution, I cannot comprehend: becauſe, in the ſixth letter to the people of England, for which I ſuffered, it is ſaid of the revolution, " I muſt recur to theſe times, when James the ſecond was exiled from theſe realms: it will be neceſſary to remind you, what were the honourable diſpoſitions of Engliſh men, the happy ſtate and condition of your commerce and taxes at that hour. At that time, the love of liberty and their conſtitution truely animated the natives of England to oppoſe the uſurpation of unlawful power in the ſovereign and his miniſters: then it was that zeal for the eſtabliſhed faith, inſpired your biſhops to reſiſt every attempt upon your religion: then it was you were a brave and honourable people: then it was that two millions ſupplied the annual expences in time

of

of war: then it was you paid only four ſhillings taxes in every twenty, which you ſpent, which are now riſen to fourteen. Such was your bliſsful ſtate when James was driven hence, and William and Mary mounted the throne of their father, and of theſe realms: a ſituation, which no other ſtate in Europe could poſſeſs; becauſe not bleſſed with ſuch natural advantages." And now I appeal to the world, whether Tommy Townſhend and ſuch a fellow as Lee, have not aſſerted *a whole* falſehood, when they ſay, "I have reviled, *in almoſt* direct terms, the revolution?"

It is true, indeed, if theſe orators mean by the revolution, the miſchiefs that were produced by thoſe miniſters who engaged this nation in an expenſive and unſucceſsful war, to ſupport the intereſts of the Dutch; who ſpread univerſal corruption through the parliament; purchaſed the members to exhauſt the treaſure, and laviſh the blood of their fellow-ſubjects, encreaſed their taxes, raiſed the prices of the neceſſaries of life, and mercileſsly mortgaged them and their poſterity for the payment of thoſe immenſe ſums which they ſquandered for alien intereſts, and to enrich themſelves; then, indeed, that fellow Lee might have left our his *almoſt*. And if expoſing ſuch enormous iniquities be reviling the *revolution*, I have reviled it, and glory in that act.

There are, in Italy, a ſet of men, known by the name of banditti, who ſeem to poſſeſs a drop of the Sydney blood, and to be actuated by whiggiſh principles. Their occupation conſiſts in robberies, and murder, and they claim the right of perpetrating ſuch execrable actions under the name of liberty of conſcience. Whenever it happens that theſe formidable and unmerciful gentlemen

tlemen of prodigious merit are diſcovered, and in danger of being apprehended, they fly to that church for a ſanctuary, whoſe holy ordinances they have conſtantly violated, and into which they have never entered, but for the ſake of committing ſacrilege, till that moment of ſeeking ſafety from the hands of public juſtice. In like manner, this fellow Lee and others who have been educated in whiggiſh principles, and all thoſe practices which have ſucceeded the expulſion of James the ſecond, fly to the *revolution*, as to an aſylum from the deteſtation which attends their miſdeeds; and thank God for having been bred in ſuch principles, as never can legitimately produce ſuch practices as they purſue: and thus they would ſanctify themſelves by a *word* inapplicable to them and their actions, without a violation of every idea that originally attended it, and hardily hold up their faces againſt truth itſelf. So much for the modeſty of Mr. Lee; I ſhall now proceed to the argumentative part of his ſpeech, in defence of his clients. It is that becauſe I receive a penſion, the printers were to eſcape conviction. If this could have anſwered that purpoſe, I ſhould have had no objection to it. But ought not that learned advocate to have reflected before he ſelected this argument from Tommy the orator, that whilſt he was bringing me as a penſioner, before the court, which as he was not pleading for a penſion for his client, did not promiſe to be of much ſervice to his cauſe; he muſt inevitably recall me as a perſon that had been puniſhed for a libel, from which accuſation it was his duty to defend his client. By that ſingular and uſeful mode of defence, did he not produce a precedent that operated in diametrical oppoſition to that end, to which his rhetoric ſhould have ſolely tended?

tended? a conſiſtency of arguing which he has imitated alſo from the reſpectable Tommy Townſhend.

Mr. Lee now riſes to the very ſummit of the ſublime, and gives us an inſtance of his oratoric powers, ſuch as is not to be found either in Longinus, or Mr. Burke. "Ruſſel, Sydney, and other ornaments of human nature, have not eſcaped the traductory malice of a libeller. In a book called Memoirs of Great Britain, they are moſt outrageouſly defamed." I have already ſhewn what an amazing ornament Sydney was to human nature. From this vehement effuſion of ill-timed panegyric in Mr. Lee; may not the world be inclined to conclude, either that his *whole* body is filled with Sydney blood; or his whole ſoul with ſimilar principle? which, if it be, may their ſimilitude be continued to the end, and his exit like that of him whom he ſo rapturouſly pronounces to be an ornament to human nature: the moſt certain way in which this gentleman can be exalted to a like diſtinction among poſterity.

Mr. Lee continues. "Not that I blame an hiſtorian for laying facts before his readers, but I blame him for prejudging a cauſe by preliminary remarks of his own; yet this is the caſe of the compiler of the book in queſtion; he prefaces his anecdotes with a prejudication of characters; and he ſays, that when the force of truth compelled him to prejudge them, he felt as a father would do whoſe ſon had cowardly turned his back in the day of battle."

Now it ſo happens, that in all this prodigious exploſion of rhetorical reſentment againſt Dalrymple, there is not one ſyllable of truth. 1ſt, That writer, in his Memoirs, is ſo far from being a traductory or malicious libeller, who has moſt out-

outrageouſly defamed both Ruſſel and Sydney, that he has adopted the opinion of Whigs and Preſbyterians, and is manifeſtly the encomiaſt of thoſe two men. 2d, The words which Mr. Lee recites are not thoſe of the hiſtorian. Theſe are, " when I found in the French diſpatches lord Ruſſel, intriguing with the court of Verſailles; and Algernon Sydney taking money from it, I felt very near the ſame ſhock, as if I had ſeen a ſon turn his back in the day of battle." Where then are the preliminary remarks of prejudging? where does he ſay the force of truth compelled him to prejudge? 3d, Theſe preliminary were poſterior remarks, and were not printed in a preface to the memoirs; and therefore could be no prejudication of the characters, unleſs that which follows precedes the thing which it ſucceeds. They were printed in a preface to the ſecond volume, containing a collection of ſtate papers, including indubitable facts, two years after the memoirs had been publiſhed. And thus it happens that the caſe, which Mr. Lee blames, has no exiſtence; and that, which he approves, is the real caſe. To what then is this truthleſs exhibition of Mr. Lee to be attributed? to his modeſt aſſurance, which incontinently prompts him to utter every kind of defamation againſt thoſe whom he pleaſes to traduce? to his ignorance, which precludes him from the underſtanding of what he reads, which has miſtaken the true ſtate for the falſe, the preface of the ſecond volume, for that of the firſt; and put that in the front which follows in the rear? or to his love of veracity, which uniformly inclines him to repreſent things as they are not? it muſt be allowed, however, that in the act of ſpeaking great words, to no purpoſe, this gentleman

tleman has exhibited a ſpecimen of *prodigious merit.*

Mr. Lee perſeveres. " But we ſee no notice taken, no complaint made of a book wherein the characters of men, hitherto deemed an honour to their country, are traduced and villified; their *defunct manes* are impiouſly inſulted, their living deſcendants are baſely diſhonoured." What notice Mr. Lee would have had taken, or complaint made againſt a book, which contains nothing but the moſt authentic documents of truth, he may explain if he can. And if the characters of thoſe he mentions have hitherto been deemed an honour to their country, it has been by rebels, regicides, republicans, Whigs, Preſbyterians, and ſuch fellows as Lee. And, according to that orator, it is an impious inſult on their *defunct manes* to prove, that Sydney was a rebel, a regicide of one king, a ſubverter of the conſtitution, a penſioned traitor of France, and a conſpirator againſt the life of another king, who gave that Sydney the privilege of living in his native country. What a bleſſed idea of impiouſneſs is generated in the conceptions of this advocate and his aſſociates! and if their heroes be traduced and villified, it is not by Sir John Dalrymple, but by truth herſelf; if ſuch calumny be applicable to what ſhe delivers. And if their living deſcendants be diſhonoured, it is by the demerits only of their dead anceſtors.

But this illuſtrious advocate is even more *unmerciful* than the *formidable* Tommy Townſhend. For he has put to *death* that which never dies. The *manes* of Ruſſel and Sydney are *defunct*. The ſoul which ſurvives the body is dead. This is an infliction on theſe two heroes; moſt *unmerciful*, indeed. Counſellor Lee has ſlain immortality

mortality itſelf, and put the very ſouls of Ruſſel and Syndey to death; a cruelty as much beyond that with which they were bodily inflicted, as the deprivation of a life for a few years is inferior to that of eternity.

Mr. Lee now tells us, "that, ſince his advance to riper years, he had well weighed the matter, and could not help looking upon William and Mary as princes endowed with every public virtue, which could render them deſerving of a throne; and every private virtue which ſhould endear them to their ſubjects." I have no inclination to alter this manner of thinking, in this admirable orator: notwithſtanding which, I ſhall preſume to declare that, be their virtues ever ſo great, the ſame virtues are to be as juſtly attributed to his preſent majeſty and his queen. And I would gladly know from what motives this ardent allegiance to dead kings, and ſuch malevolent invectives heaped on me for having, as they ſay, reviled them, can proceed. On what account, their former ſovereigns are ſo extolled, and I am conſtantly brought back to puniſhment? but ſuch is the truth, theſe violences are not committed on me, becauſe I have traduced dead ſovereigns, as they aſſert; but becauſe I will not revile the living. From this ſource ſprings that ſtream of calumny which they have turned in upon me. Had I continued the libeller they report me, their approbation would then be equal to their preſent ſlander; I might have received the glorious appellation of a patriot; and have been an illuſtrious chairman at the bill of rights. But let me be expoſed a thouſand times on the pillory, and ſent to priſon, for ſuch deeds as I have already ſuffered, rather than be doomed to the principles of ſuch men,

men, and to preſiding in their chair; for this would be *infamy* indelible.

Counſellor Lee has, indeed, given us his opinion of the princes, William and Mary, without favouring the public with his reaſons for adopting it. I have given mine, alſo, reſpecting his preſent majeſty, and his royal conſort. I will not reſt my ſentiments on aſſertion, but preſume to compare the public and the private virtues of the princes, on the throne, with thoſe of the former pair, and leave the world to determine, in whom they are the moſt exalted; and whether I be not as perfectly juſtified, in this ſentiment, as Mr. Lee and all his confederates of ſimilar education and principles can be in theirs. With this view, I ſhall begin with thoſe tranſactions which have been imputed to his majeſty as criminally adminiſtered, expoſe the futility and falſehood of ſuch imputations; bring inſtances of ſimilar events, in the reign of king William, and then defy Tommy Townſhend, Lee, and all of old whiggiſh principles to refute what I ſhall deliver, or to ſuggeſt that their preſent majeſties are not as juſtly entitled to the encomium of public and of private virtues, as thoſe princes whom they ſo much extol.

1. The firſt imputation of offence, in his majeſty, is that of favouritiſm to lord Bute. That nobleman was born a Britiſh ſubject. By that birth, he is equally entitled, with all others, to diſtinctions in poſt and place. By his conduct, near his majeſty, when prince of Wales, he acquired his eſteem and affection, and received the effects of them, when the crown devolved on his head. This favourite received no diſtinctive marks from his ſovereign beyond that of the order of the garter, and a peerage for his lady.

1. Let me now ſhew the effects of favouritiſm, in the reign of king William. Bentinck, a foreigner, was raiſed from being a gentleman of the bed-chamber to the prince of Orange, to an earl and marquis of England. He was preſented with five parts in ſix of the whole country of Denbeigh, with 135,820 acres of the forfeited eſtates in Ireland; with large donations of land in England, and was, in fact, the ſole miniſter. Keppel, another favourite, a Dutchman, and page to the king, was made earl of Albemarle, honoured with the order of the garter, and preſented with 108,633 acres of the Iriſh forfeitures. Ginckle, a Dutchman, was created earl of Athlone. Rouvigny, a French refugee, earl of Galway. Theſe were preſented with portions of the ſame lands; the former with 26,480, and the latter with 36,148 acres. Elizabeth Villiers, a *female* favourite, was made counteſs of Orkney, and preſented with 95,649 acres of king James's private eſtate in Ireland, of the yearly income of 25,995*l.* On theſe, and a few others, were beſtowed, in acres, 1,060,792, —in rent, 221,223*l.*—in value, clear of all incumbrances, 1,699,343*l.* Such was the account delivered into parliament, by the commiſſioners, who were ſent to examine into that affair, previous to the reſumption, and as ratified by the houſe of commons.

2. Lord Bute was inhumanly abuſed for making, and his majeſty for ſigning, the laſt treaty of peace with France. And yet, at this time, the expences of the laſt year amounted to more than 20,000,000*l.* including debts incurred and ſums for the current year, that were raiſed without a loan. Theſe were borrowed on new taxes, and the debts were not diſcharged till after the peace. The premium alſo for procuring this money amounted to more

more than thirty *per cent.* the funds were ſunk to ſixty-five; and a bankruptcy imminently hung over the ſtate, which, in all probability, would have fallen on it, had the war, with all poſſible ſucceſs, continued two years longer, by which many tho uſands of the ſubjects had inevitably been reduced to the utmoſt diſtreſs. This peace was approved by parliament; and by that treaty the nation acquired ſeveral iſlands of great value in the Weſt Indies, the extenſive province of Canada, and a number of loyal ſubjects to oppoſe the rebellious intentions of the democratic ſectaries in America, whoſe inſolence has excited them not only to determine what merchandiſe ſhall be imported into that part of his majeſty's dominions; but to throw into the rivers whatever they diſapprove, when it arrives: and to treat with barbarous outrage their fellow-ſubjects who ſhall diſcharge their duty, by carrying them to that country, from this kingdom.

2. King William entered into a treaty of alliance with the Emperor, Engliſh, Spaniſh, Italian and Dutch, wherein they proteſt, before God, hat they will not make peace with Lewis the fourteenth until he had made reparation to the *Holy See*, and until he had annulled all his infamous proceedings againſt *holy father Innocent* the eleventh, and reſtored to the proteſtants of France all their poſſeſſions, and an entire liberty of conſcience. And the proteſtants were therein invited to rebel, and threatened with deſtruction if they did not join them in arms againſt their lawful ſovereign. Notwithſtanding this ſolemn aſſeveration king William deſerted the Emperor, and concluded a ſeparate peace. The pope was ſatisfied, and the French proteſtants, whom he had excited to rebellion, were ſcandalouſly left to the reſentment of Lewis the fourteenth; and their conſciences at full liberty

to continue their rebellions, without a ſyllable being ſtipulated in their favour in that treaty, which king William had ſolemnly proteſted before God, not to conclude before their liberties and poſſeſſions were reſtored, and their religion tolerated in France. The ſame king concluded the partition treaty, with Lewis the fourteenth, by the negotiation of Bentinck, an alien, without laying it before either the parliament, or even the privy-council. For the execution of this, the lord chancellor Somers, of old whiggiſh principles, in obedience to a letter from king William, ſent full powers and blank papers into Holland, to which he had affixed the great ſeal of England, without communicating it to the other lords of the regency, or the privy-council, in order that the king might inſert what terms, and appoint what commiſſioners he pleaſed. By this treaty, during the life of the Spaniſh ſovereign, he preſumed to diſtribute his dominions, and thereby inſidiouſly conveyed, together with his territories, the ſubjects of that monarch to other princes, after his deceaſe; as a Jamaica planter does his lands and his negroes to the perſon to whom he transfers his effects. And this unheard-of violation on ſovereigns and ſubjects, and even on the rights of human nature, was tranſacted without the knowledge of that prince, and that people who were thus diſpoſed of. This treaty produced a new war, which coſt this ſtate, and encreaſed the national debt ſo many millions during the reign of queen Anne.

3. The miniſtry ſeized John Wilkes and his papers by a general warrant; ſent him priſoner to the tower, from whence he was diſcharged after a confinement of three days; and for which, by a verdict, he received four thouſand pounds from lord Hallifax, then ſecretary of ſtate.

3. King

3. King William, when prince of Orange, arreſted the earl of Feverſham, for no other offence than that of bringing him a letter from king James, who was then in England: and afterwards upon ſuſpicion only from intercepted letters, took into cuſtody the earl of Arran, Sir Robert Hamilton, and ſent them priſoners to the tower, which Tindal allows to be illegal, the rights of the ſubjects being thereby infringed, and the habeas corpus act violated. And to obviate all proſecutions, for ſo heinous an outrage on Engliſh liberty, an act of indemnity, for thoſe who adviſed it, was paſſed in the ſubſequent ſeſſions of parliament. During his reign, and all others, even to the time in which Mr. Wilkes was apprehended, general warrants, and ſeizing papers, were conſtantly in practice; except in the latter part of queen Anne's reign, when the Tories, calumniated as enemies to liberty, were in adminiſtration; after which, the practice was revived and continued. It was by a general warrant I and my papers were ſeized, when lord Chatham was prime miniſter. And when I objected to the illegality of the proceeding, another warrant was delivered me three days after I had been in cuſtody; but being deſerted by thoſe who ought to have aſſiſted me, I was rendered incapable of ſeeking redreſs by law.

4. Another imputation of criminality was, that of the houſe of commons, expelling John Wilkes, eſq; after he had been duly elected by the freeholders of Middleſex. John Wilkes, eſq; at the time of his election, was an outlaw, and twenty thouſand pounds leſs worth than a ſhilling. He was thereby diſqualified to enjoy every right of a Britiſh ſubject, and of poſſeſſing any property in the kingdom, had there been any which remained for him to poſſeſs. On that account,

count, he could not be elected but with a violation of the conſtitution and the laws. Under theſe circumſtances, it was a culpable lenity not to have fined the ſheriff who returned him: and Proctor and Cook were in fact the legal members. On his re-election, when the outlawry was reverſed, he was again expelled and diſqualified from ſitting in that parliament. This was done for writing a libel on lord Weymouth. Precedents in point are to be ſeen in the journals of the houſe of commons. Dr. Parry and Arthur Hall were both expelled and diſqualified for libels. Added to all this, Mr. Wilkes had been previouſly found guilty of four libels; three againſt God, and one againſt his king. Had he been permitted to have ſat, as a member, in that parliament, his privilege would have ſecured him from all puniſhment, as the offence of a libel is not one of thoſe, which, by law, will authoriſe the commitment of a member of the commons to a priſon. The cauſe of God and the king demanded that the privilege of the houſe ſhould not protect him from puniſhment for ſuch heinous iniquities.

4. On king James's abdication, a few men, unelected by the people, and at the excluſion of all others, were called together by the prince of Orange. Theſe transferred the adminiſtration of public affairs into his hands, adviſed him to call a convention, though not yet a king; and this convention deprived king James of all future right to reaſcend the throne of the three kingdoms. Was this an object of leſs conſideration than the affair of John Wilkes? had ſuch a convention a precedented right of expelling one king for ever, and of putting another on his throne; and had the commons of England, after numberleſs precedents, no right

to

to expel and to diſqualify John Wilkes from ſitting in parliament, for the duration of ſeven years only? whatever ſubject, after the depoſing of king James, to whom he had ſworn allegiance, ſhould preſume to attempt his reſtoration, that man was a rebel, by the laws, and executed as a traitor. But the freeholders of Middleſex dared to re-elect John Wilkes, and petition the king to diſſolve the parliament, for not admitting their hero to ſit among them. I conclude, that the maladminiſtration of king James juſtly drew upon him the fate he ſuffered. And I have hitherto diſcovered no reaſon to think, that Mr. Wilkes had any right to have been treated with ſo ſingular a favour, as to be received after diſqualification.

5. Another cauſe of calumny was the king's refuſing to comply with the London, the Middleſex, and a very few other petitions, to diſſolve the parliament; becauſe the freeholders of that county, and the people, were not fairly repreſented; and as Mr. Wilkes was fairly elected, and not permitted to ſit in the houſe, it was an unlawful parliament. A multiplicity of other particulars, as fallaciouſly grounded, were included in theſe petitions; and then his majeſty was requeſted to diſmiſs his miniſters from his councils and preſence for ever. The firſt was an object that could not conſtitutionally come before his majeſty; becauſe it is an eſtabliſhed maxim, that a king of Great Britain cannot attend to any repreſentation of what may paſs in the houſe of commons, without it come directly from that houſe. To the other objects of their remonſtrance, had they really exiſted, his prerogative could not lawfully extend. And even the very act of thus petitioning, addreſſing, and remonſtrating, by a lord mayor, and part of the

London

London corporation, to diſmiſs a miniſtry on the hardineſs of their aſſertion only, was an inſolence unexampled, and a moſt culpable temerity.

5. The commons reſolve to addreſs king William to iſſue a proclamation for the apprehending of Ludlow, the regicide, then in England. The king delays his compliance therewith, until he knew him to be ſafely arrived in Holland. They again wait on his majeſty with their reſolution, reſpecting the reſumption of the forfeited lands in Ireland, with which the king, by an equivocating anſwer, evades his compliance; and it is obtained, at laſt, by being tacked to a money bill, from which he was afraid to with-hold his aſſent. The commons reſolved to addreſs his majeſty, that no perſon, who was not a native of his dominions, except the prince of Denmark, be admitted to his councils in England or Ireland. To prevent this addreſs, and to preſerve his foreign favourites from being excluded, the king ſuddenly prorogues the parliament.

The commons petition the king to remove the earls of Portland, Somers, Halifax, and Orford, from his councils; for having adviſed the partition treaty. The king evades an anſwer. They are impeached by the commons, for high crimes and miſdemeanours. Somers, for having affixed the great ſeal of England to full powers for concluding a peace, without the commiſſioners being named, or the conditions of the peace made known to him; and to blank-papers, to be filled up by the king and Bentinck, as his majeſty might pleaſe. This was done without communicating the affair to the reſt of the lords-juſtices, or adviſing with the privy council. By the king's influence in the houſe of lords, a quarrel aroſe between them and the

the commons about the time of bringing the impeached lords to trial. The houſe of lords arbitrarily appoint a day before the commons are prepared. The latter object to that proceeding, as unconſtitutional; and refuſe to attend on that day. Lord Somers and the others are brought to trial before the lords, in Weſtminſter-Hall, at which time, the commons not appearing to carry on the impeachment, the trial does not proceed, and the offenders are thereby acquitted. Such was the event of that enormous crime of affixing the great ſeal of England, previous to the contents, which were to be inſerted in the papers; and thereby imparting an authority to the king, of ratifying, without the knowledge and conſent of the privy council, whatever might be deſtructive to the welfare of this kingdom. Such did that very partition treaty prove to be. It produced a long and expenſive war to ſupport the Dutch, which waſted rivers of blood, and millions of our treaſure, leaving the nation with their debts encreaſed from 17 millions, at the death of king William, to 52 millions, at the death of queen Anne.

6. Extending the prerogative makes no inconſiderable figure among the calumnies againſt his preſent majeſty. And this was founded on the moſt humane and moſt laudable act of royalty; a proclamation, whereby his majeſty prohibited the exportation of corn, at a time when the price was enormous, and the people in danger of a famine. Had it been delayed till the parliament had met, which could not have been in leſs than forty days, that time might have proved to be ſufficient for the unrelenting luſt of gain to have exported half the grain of the kingdom, and to have reduced the people to the utmoſt diſtreſs. To this

exertion

exertion of the prerogative royal, I am fully convinced, his majeſty is juſtly entitled. But had he not, it was of ſuch a nature, that every man of ſenſibility for the miſeries of his fellow-ſubjects, muſt have applauded the royal beneficence.

6. King William exerted his prerogative, in another way. He refuſed to give the royal aſſent to the bill for triennial parliaments, and to another, for excluding placemen and penſioners from the houſe of commons. And when the houſe addreſſed him, on that ſubject, he evaded the intention of that addreſs, by an equivocal anſwer. When the commons were preparing to impeach Trevor and others, for receiving bribes, and being guilty of moſt notorious corruptions, the king defeated that affair by a ſudden prorogation of parliament. By his prerogative, he granted to the Eaſt India company the right of ſeizing the goods and ſhips of all other ſubjects, who might preſume to trade in any parts beyond the Cape of Good Hope. By this charter, the natives of England were reſcinded from their conſtitutional rights, that had been granted by Magna Charta, which expreſsly mentions the privilege of trading in all parts of the globe. Beſides this abolition of that privilege reſpecting Engliſhmen, the Dutch, and all other aliens whatſoever, were entitled to become members of that company. To that company king William granted not only the legiſlative power of making what laws they pleaſed; but the executive alſo, of appointing their own judges in India. And thereby the two moſt incongruous powers were united that can ſubſiſt in the ſame community; an union totally ſubverſive of freedom, of the ſecurity of life and poſſeſſions, and repugnant to the conſtitution of England. Beſides this

this ſtretch, a power was given to the king, and paſſed into a law by the repreſentatives of the people, by which his majeſty might eſtabliſh whatever rules, qualifications, and appointments, in that charter, he might think reaſonable. Such was the unlimited and unwarrantable authority then imparted to king William, by the delegated guardians of the rights and privileges of Engliſhmen; unexampled in its extent and nature, but by that law, which, in the reign of Henry the eighth, transferred an authority to the proclamations of that tyrant equal to the ſtatutes of the realm.

7. When the civil magiſtrate was called on to preſerve the peace, and to read the riot act, to a lawleſs mob, met in St. George's Fields, with an apparent intention of reſcuing John Wilkes, eſq; from priſon; and a ſmall part of the ſoldiery was thought neceſſary to prevent the ill effects of their tumultuous proceedings, the act being read, the tumult not only continued, but even the magiſtrate was inſulted and wounded by a brick, or by ſome other thing of a like dangerous nature, which was thrown at him. The neceſſity of the caſe required the juſtice of peace to command the ſoldiers to fire; and one or more perſons were thereby killed. Among theſe was one Allen, whom two or three of the ſoldiers followed into a cowhouſe, and put to death. This was juſtly conſidered as an exceeding of legal authority. One of the ſoldiers, ſuſpected of this death, was ſeized, impriſoned, and tried at Guildford; where it was clearly proved, that he was not a perſon concerned in that unlawful tranſaction. The man, who was the actual offender, was ſaid to have fled from juſtice, and lord Barrington, in his majeſty's name, thanked the officer for doing his duty.

This

This whole tranſaction was unjuſtly imputed to the king, although it were abſolutely impoſſible that his majeſty could have had the leaſt knowledge of the matter. The letter from the ſecretary of war was purely official, and exactly ſuch, as in the reign of king George the ſecond, had been tranſmitted to the officer who commanded at Coventry, when great numbers were killed by the ſoldiery, in ſuppreſſing a riot about the turnpikes. Notwithſtanding theſe circumſtances proceeded regularly according to the ſtatutes of the realm, the death of Allen excepted; and *that* becauſe he was followed from the place of the riot, this event was denominated the maſſacre of St. George's Fields. And every artifice was exerted to excite the people to an inſurrection.

7. In the reign of king William, after the Macdonals of Glencoe had taken the oaths, by law required; and were peaceably returned to their own country, an armed force was inſidiouſly ſent as friends among them, and in one night thirty-eight men were ſlain in their beds. An accident alone prevented that flagitious act of cruelty from being extended to many thouſands of this and of other clans. The king with his own hand ſigned the warrant, which authorized this maſſacre, both above and below. And, notwithſtanding every attempt that was made, he would never permit any of thoſe to be puniſhed, who were concerned in this murder, attended with every aggravating circumſtance that can enter into ſo execrable a deed, "conſcious that, in their cauſe, his own was involved."

8. Another ſource of diſpleaſure againſt his majeſty, was the pardoning of Macquirk and Kennedy, who had been found guilty of murder. Macquirk had been at Brentford on the day of Mr. Wilkes's

ſecond

ſecond election; and a riot ariſing, one Clark had his head broken by Macquirk. Several days had paſſed, after this affair had happened, before Clark was taken ill. Mr. Sparling, apothecary, attended him; and, as I recollect, Mr. Bromfield the ſurgeon ſaw him alſo. Clark dying ſo opportunely for their cauſe, the patriots thought it a favourable occaſion of aſcribing it to the blow he had received at Brentford; and accordingly one Foote, a patriotic ſurgeon, was employed to open the body, in order to diſcover the cauſe of his death. An inqueſt was taken by the coroner and his jury. Mr. Sparling depoſed that Clark died of a fever. Foote, that he died of the wound received at Brentford. I ſhall take no notice of the manner in which the evidence was obtained, of Macquirk's being the perſon who gave the blow. Macquirk was then ſeized and committed to gaol, took his trial, and by a ſtrange overſight, neither Mr. Sparling nor Mr. Bromfield were called as evidence on the trial. Foote ſwore that Clark died of his wound received at Brentford; and on the verdict being given, guilty of death, the patriots that delight not in blood, ſhouted aloud for joy. And proved by that inhuman exultation, that the ſpirit of revenge, and not of juſtice, had incited them to the trial of Macquirk. When this ſingular affair was repreſented to his majeſty, and it was known that Foote, the ſole witneſs on his trial, had never ſeen Clark till he was dead; and that Mr. Sparling and Mr. Bromfield were not ſubpœna'd on that trial, who had depoſed at the coroner's inqueſt, that Clark did not die of the wounds received at Brentford, it was clearly ſeen that their oaths would certainly have ſet aſide the evidence of Foote. That duty therefore which ought

to

to be inſeparable from the breaſt of every ſovereign, of preventing any ſubject from being put to death unjuſtly, determined his majeſty to be ſatisfied of the reaſons which induced this Foote to give ſuch an evidence. In conſequence of this humane reſolve, a number of ſurgeons, of the greateſt reputation in their profeſſion, the moſt unexceptionable in their characters, and, by their fortunes, above all temptation from pecuniary influence, was appointed to hear what Mr. Foote had to offer in favour of that opinion, on which his oath was grounded. It would be an abſurdity to conceive, that he, who had ſworn in the preceding manner, did not deliver every thing which might beſt ſupport his evidence. Yet ſuch was the event, that, notwithſtanding all he offered, the gentlemen who examined him, and who could as perfectly judge from Foote's relation, as he had done from the diſſection only, whether he or Mr. Sparling were right in their opinion reſpecting the death of Clarke, were unanimouſly of opinion that his death was not cauſed by that wound. I will appeal, therefore, to the ſenſe of every unprejudiced perſon, whether his majeſty, after the circumſtances of this affair had been thus examined into, and laid before him, could have conſented to the execution of Macquirk, without being deemed as inſtrumental in putting him to death unjuſtly. Happy Engliſhmen! if you were ſenſible of the ſupreme felicity of being ſubjects to a ſovereign, whom neither popular applauſe can allure, nor popular calumny intimidate from treading in the paths of juſtice and of mercy! by whom the innocent, and thoſe who deſerve not death, are not forſaken, and ſuffered to expire by the hands of the common executioner, through

fear

fear of party rage, as in the reign of Charles the ſecond, that inexpreſſible diſgrace to ſovereignty. He, when numbers of his ſubjects were doomed to die the victims of remorſeleſs vengeance, and of perjurers, ſuborned by regicides and republicans; when the repreſentation of *their* innocence, and the perjuries of their purſuers were laid before him, ſlunk, like a daſtard, from the calls of juſtice, the admonitions of conſcience, and the duty of a king, and ſaid; "I dare not pardon any one; his blood be upon your head, and not upon mine." And thus the innocent were led to ignominious ſlaughter, and the enemies of truth, mercy, and of the conſtitution, triumphed in their execrable actions, and revelled in the guiltleſs blood of their fellow-ſubjects.

Kennedy was, indeed, a murderer, and ought to have ſuffered that ſentence to which he was juſtly doomed. But ſuch is the well known fact, that a perſon of diſtinction, ſeduced by the allurements of that murderer's ſiſter, whom he then kept as his harlot, forgot, at once, both his feelings for the ſlain, and his duty to his ſovereign. And by his means, application was made to his majeſty, with a miſrepreſentation of the fact in favour of Kennedy. There is not a virtue of the human heart that may not, by artifice and deception, be induced to exceed the limits which are, by nature aſſigned to its exertion. His majeſty liſtened to the application, unknowing from what motive it proceeded; and perſuaded that no man of ſuch eminence and rank, as he that applied, would preſume to miſrepreſent and to deceive him, pardon was obtained for Kennedy. By theſe means, in one inſtance, exceſs of virtue hath ſaved a villain from condign puniſhment. But can it therefore

fore be conſidered as a national misfortune, that mercy has been once miſplaced, and cruelty hitherto a ſtranger to the boſom of that king who now reigns over us?

8. During the reign of king William, all legal proſecution was either totally ſuſpended, or pardons granted even to ſuch murderers whoſe crimes no artifice could conceal, nor miſrepreſentation diſguiſe. The Glencoe aſſaſſins were preſerved from proſecution. Somers, Trevor, and innumerable others, who had violated the conſtitution, and plundered their country, were, by court management, prevented from receiving their due puniſhment. And laſtly, Titus Oates, that nefarious perjurer, in conſequence of whoſe enormities, more than twenty innocent men were put to death; his ſentence, the king attempted to have reverſed. But the commons refuſed to gratify him in ſo impious an act. That villain, was not only pardoned, but penſioned alſo. The reaſon of this flagitious favour being granted to ſo execrable a wretch, may, perhaps, receive ſome explanation from a paſſage uniformly omitted by all the hiſtorians of that prince's reign; although it be equally authentic with any other of his tranſactions whatſoever. "* I preſume to declare, ſays the count d'Avaux, that I have omitted nothing which may diſcover the combinations that the prince of Orange has engaged in with the moſt abandoned of the Engliſh. On the 21ſt of September, 1679, I ſent intelligence that Oates, who has ſince that time been ſo notorious; Freeman, of whom I have already ſpoken; and Du Moulin, a man of intrigue, and an execrable villain, arrived together in Holland ſome years paſt,

* D'Avaux, Tom. 1. p. 32.

paſt, and that the prince of Orange had been in great conferences with them."

From this paſſage, may it not be reaſonably ſuggeſted, from whence the contrivance of that plot, which never had a real exiſtence, originated; by which ſo many innocent men were inhumanly executed. Was it in the boſom of the prince of Orange, or did he only acquieſce in, and ſupport that infernal perpetration? may not this pardon and penſion of ſo execrable a villain, as Titus Oates, have emanated from the ſame humane ſenſation with the ſigning of the diſpatch, that authorized the Glencoe maſſacre, and reſcinded all means of bringing the murderers to juſtice? and was not the cauſe of Oates, in this inſtance alſo, that in which the king was equally involved?

Mercy, it muſt be owned, was not among the vices of king William: for in the act of indemnity, paſſed in the year 1690, more perſons were excepted, than at the reſtoration, after the kingdom had been ſo long deluged in civil blood, the conſtitution, civil and eccleſiaſtic, ſubverted, and the king murdered at Whitehall. And it is a well known fact, that ſeveral perſons, apprehended and confined in Newgate, without their being brought to trial, through want of evidence, remained in that jail; and after an impriſonment of many years, therein expired.

9. There is yet another imputation of criminality againſt his majeſty; becauſe he pardoned Jones, who had been found guilty of the moſt unnatural, deteſtable, and unpardonable of all crimes. But ſuch being the nefariouſneſs of the deed, ought not the commiſſion of it to be proved in the moſt unexceptionable manner? becauſe the mercy of the ſovereign cannot otherwiſe be de-

cently extended to ſuch abominable criminals. That the witneſs and the circumſtances of this evidence, againſt Jones, render the crime juſtly to be ſuſpected; or, at leaſt, that it was not proved, by depoſition, adequate to the infliction of death, appears to be too evident to be contradicted. And all lawyers whom I have heard to ſpeak on that ſubject, are unanimouſly of opinion that, on the ſole evidence of the boy ſo circumſtanced, Jones ought not to have ſuffered death. The clamour excited on this occaſion, ſprang entirely from the malignant intentions of thoſe patriotic ſpirits who omit not any opportunity of ſlandering the beſt of ſovereigns.

9. Whether king William would have pardoned Jones, had he been on the throne, I ſhall leave to the judgment of my readers; after having recited what his hiſtorians have delivered. Tindal ſays, he was not addicted to *women*. Biſhop Burnet pronounces, "that he had no vice but of one ſort, in which he was very cautious and ſecret." What this vice was, ſays Tindal, he has left the world to gueſs; by which means, the worſt of vice has been, by his enemies, fixed upon him. * Count D'Avaux ſays, "there was ſo much affectation in the civilities that the prince of Orange expreſſed for the duke of Monmouth, that he ſeemed to ſeek, with pleaſure, every occaſion of inſulting the king of England. He indulged him with the ſame liberty which was ſhewn to Bentinck only, that of *entering* whenever he pleaſed into the prince's *chamber*. He ſcarcely beſtowed a favour, but at his recommendation. And no one imagined he had properly paid his court to the prince, if he left it unperformed to the duke of Monmouth.

* Tom. 3. p. 121.

Monmouth. All perſons, of the beſt quality in Holland, contended with each other who ſhould entertain him. It ſeemed as if the prince of Orange had changed his humour, or that he entertained ſome *deſigns* which were *not well comprehended*. For he who was the moſt jealous of all human beings, even to a degree of not permitting his princeſs to receive any particular viſit, not only from man, but even from woman alſo, preſſed the duke of Monmouth to ſee the princeſs every afternoon, to teach her country dancing. He obliged the princeſs to learn to ſcate on the ice, becauſe the duke of Monmouth had an inclination to learn that exerciſe. It was one of the moſt extraordinary ſights imaginable to ſee the princeſs of Orange on ſcates upon the ice, with her petticoats tucked up learning to ſcate, ſometimes on one foot, and then on the other." I need not remark that the duke of Monmouth was reckoned to be the handſomeſt of all Engliſhmen.

Burnet ſays, "about this time, 1699, the king ſet up a new favourite, Keppel, a gentleman of Gueldres. He was raiſed from being a page into the higheſt degree of favour, that any perſon had ever attained to, about the king. He was now made earl of Albemarle, and ſoon after, knight of the garter; and by a quick and *unaccountable* progreſs, he ſeemed to have engroſſed the royal favour ſo entirely, that he diſpoſed of every thing that was in the king's power. He was a chearful young man, that had the *art* to *pleaſe*; but he could ſcarce ſubmit to the attendance and *drudgery* that was *neceſſary* to maintain his poſt. He never had yet diſtinguiſhed himſelf in any thing, though the king did it in every thing. He was not *cold* nor *dry*, as the earl of Portland was thought to be."

Are not the former preciſely the marks of favour with which Charles the ſecond diſtinguiſhed all his *female* favourites; and the latter, thoſe of diſlike for which he put off one and took another?

"The earl of Portland, continues the biſhop, obſerved the progreſs of this favour, and with great uneaſineſs. They grew to be not only incompatible, as all *rivals* for *favour* muſt be, but to *hate* and oppoſe one another in every thing; by which the king's affairs ſuffered much. Portland withdrew from the court, and laid down all his employments." Madam la Valliere, the favourite miſtreſs of Lewis the fourteenth, on being ſupplanted by a rival left the court, and retired into the convent of the Carmelites. I ſhall leave my readers to determine whether Jones, under a like ſentence in the reign of the glorious king William, had been pardoned or not. It is my opinion, he would not only have received that favour, but a conſiderable penſion. Becauſe Titus Oates, a penſioner of king William, had been expelled from on board a ſhip of war for ſodomy.

10. Among the various charges which calumny hath laid againſt his majeſty, that of robbing the duke of Portland, by a grant of Inglewood forreſt and the manor of Carliſle to Sir James Lowther, made a moſt amazing outcry. Since that time it has been proved, in a court of law, that not only the part of that forreſt which was thus granted, had never been granted to the Portland family; but that it was illegally aſſumed. That the manor of Carliſle had never been a grant from the crown, is evident, becauſe it was a purchaſe for life of the laſt ſurviving Leſſee, to whom it had been granted by Catherine, queen dowager of Charles the ſecond. And conſequently, after the death of that Leſſee, the Portlands had held it illegally

legally from the crown. Hence it appears, that, inſtead of his majeſty's robbing the dukes of Portland, his anceſtors had robbed the crown; and he unlawfully retained what they uſurped.

10. It is an uniform opinion that whenever the crown of England devolves on the lawful ſucceſſor, that the kingdom of Ireland conſtitutionally becomes a part of his dominions. But as king William was elevated to the throne by a convention of men called together by a prince of Orange, before he was made king of England, ſome doubts have ariſen, whether, in ſuch caſe, the Iriſh were obliged to receive him as their ſovereign alſo. They had ſworn allegiance to James the ſecond. He had never been conſidered by them as attempting to ſubvert their religion, or to enſlave them. And he could not be ſaid to have abdicated that kingdom; becauſe he was arrived among them to preſerve it to himſelf. Under theſe circumſtances, does it clearly appear, by what means the Iriſh could have been denominated rebels, for taking arms in defence of king James? and if not rebels, how their eſtates could have been forfeited, by their adherence to their only acknowledged ſovereign? Whether they were rebels, or not, I ſhall not preſume to determine: nor conſequently if their eſtates were legal forfeitures. But there is one forfeiture, which ſeems to be of a moſt ſingular kind. It is, that king James ſhould be conſidered as a rebel for defending his kingdom againſt king William, and thereby forfeit that eſtate, in Ireland, which he held as private property. This, however, amounting to more than twenty five thouſand pounds, of annual rent, was taken from him, and given to Elizabeth Villiers, king William's *countenancing* female favourite. But I am not lawyer

yer enough to determine whether this be or be not a robbery. I leave that to the learned Mr. Lee.

11. The inattention of the miniſtry to the Corſicans, when the French had landed on their iſland, with intent to take poſſeſſion of it, was another ſubject of patriotic clamour. The brave, the meritorious and freeborn Corſicans were aſſerted to be moſt ſhamefully deſerted; and even, that the cauſe of liberty herſelf was ſacrificed to the king of France. Theſe patriotic zealots for liberty were therefore implacable, becauſe his majeſty would not become the Don Quixote of all ſovereigns; and waſte the blood of thouſands of his ſubjects, and millions of their money, in defence of men whoſe freedom could not have been ſecured, but by an eternal war; even ſuppoſing we could have aſſiſted them ſo effectually as to repel the French forces from the iſland. If we had ſought it for ourſelves and taken poſſeſſion of it, I am in doubt whether the Corſicans would have thought their liberties improved by a change of maſters, and have deſiſted from taking arms againſt the troops of England. Of this I am convinced, that to have preſerved that iſland, would have coſt, in one year, as many Britiſh lives, as there are Corſicans who are able to bear arms within it; and five times as much money as the fee ſimple of it is worth; to ſay nothing of the too extenſive ſtate of our foreign dominions, nor that the French had purchaſed it from the Genoeſe, to whom the Corſicans were ſubjects. What reaſonable pretence could his majeſty have formed for engaging in the affairs of Corſica? if that iſland be of that immenſe import, which the patriots affect to deſcribe it, on what account have the king of Sardinia, the duke of Tuſcany, and other Italian potentates

potentates conſidered it as an object altogether unworthy their concern, although it lie ſo near to their dominions? what then is Corſica to us, or what are we to Corſica?

11. King William ſolemnly proteſted before God never to make peace until the French Hugonots were reſtored to their poſſeſſions; to the peaceable enjoyment of their religion, and till liberty was reſtored to France, by re-eſtabliſhing the ſtates of that kingdom. He nevertheleſs concluded a peace with that monarch, without the leaſt mention of either of theſe particulars. And left his brother Calviniſts in the hands of a tyrant.

12. When the Spaniards had compelled the Engliſh to leave Falkland's Iſland, what an exquiſite ſenſe for the honour of old England did the patriots expreſs: nothing but war would ſatisfy their indignation, and vengeance was to be poured on the Spaniards for this egregious inſult on the Engliſh nation. His majeſty and his miniſtry were treated with the higheſt indignity, for ſuch ſhameful puſillanimity, as that of not declaring hoſtilities on the moment. Nevertheleſs, the king and miniſters by their firmneſs and wiſdom were not of the ſame opinion, which theſe clamorous ſubjects appeared to be. They conceived that neither the blood nor treaſure of his ſubjects was to be wantonly waſted, at the incitement of ſuch turbulent exclaimers. In conſequence of this paternal care in the king, he by treaty obtained the recall of the Spaniards, and the iſland was reſumed by his ſubjects. No blood was ſpilt. And ſmall was the expence, in preparing for a vindication of the nation's rights and honour, ſhould the Spaniard refuſe compliance with what was required. Spain acceded to our terms, peace was confirmed, and patriotiſm was grievouſly diſappointed

pointed, by that humane negociation which ſpared our lives and treaſure, and reſcinded them from the hopes of carrying their ſanguinary principles into execution, whilſt the kingdom was engaged in a foreign war.

12. In the reign of king William, the people of Scotland, planted a colony on the Iſthmus of Darien. By which the ſmuggling trade on that coaſt, ſo advantageous to the Dutch, was in danger of being demoliſhed. The king's miniſters in Scotland encouraged the Scots in this undertaking, thinking it would prove abortive; or, by the immenſe expenſe, cure them of the inclination of engaging in ſimilar undertakings for the future. During this conduct, in Scotland, his Majeſty, in the greateſt privacy, ſent officers to Jamaica, the Leward Iſlands, and the continent of America, and proclamations were iſſued, in his name, ſtrictly commanding his ſubjects, on no pretence whatever, to hold correſpondence with, or to afford any aſſiſtance, by arms, ammunition, proviſions or neceſſaries whatſoever, to the Scots at Darien. In this manner, whilſt the Scottiſh ſubjects were encouraged at home to compleat their ſettlements at Darien, they were treated as outlaws abroad, and deprived of every thing neceſſary for their ſupport. In this ſtate, being attacked by the Spaniards, they were driven from the ſettlement; and in ſpite of every application that could be made by all Scotland, no attention was paid to it, no demand was made on the Spaniards to compenſate for this violence. But Britiſh honour and Britiſh intereſt ſilently gave way to the more powerful motives of Dutch affection, which reigned predominant in that king's heart; who, from being a petty prince, and ſervant of the united provinces

vinces, was exalted to the thrones of three powerful kingdoms.

13. When his preſent majeſty aſcended the throne, he choſe to have his civil liſt fixed at eight hundred thouſand pounds a year; the ſame it had been in the reign of king George the ſecond; with this difference only, that the ſurplus, which had ariſen from the revenues appropriated to the payment of it, and had been applied by the preceding miniſters to the king's private uſe, was now to contribute to the national expence, in augmentation of the ſinking fund. This ſurplus was then known to have been very conſiderable. And ſince that time, the duties appropriated to the diſcharge of the civil liſt, have amounted, on an average of the fourteen years of the preſent reign, to more than a million annually. In conſequence of the preceding eſtabliſhment of eight hundred thouſand pounds, the public has received an annual advantage of two hundred thouſand; being in the whole ſum two millions eight hundred thouſand pounds. But as from this diminution of the uſual revenue which aroſe from the whole duties appropriated thereto, in the reign of king George the ſecond, his majeſty's civil liſt inevitably incurred a debt of ſix hundred thouſand pounds. The miniſtry, conſcious of the advantage which the kingdom had received from the aſcertaining of the yearly revenue at the ſum above-mentioned, applied to parliament for a grant to diſcharge the preceding debt; and as it was requeſted with reaſon, it was granted with juſtice. This application was not unprecedented in former reigns, in which no advantage had been derived to the nation, from the ſurplus of the revenue that exceeded the ſum eſtabliſhed for the civil liſt expences.

pences. It is manifeſt, however, by adding the ſix hundred thouſand pounds raiſed to the eight hundred thouſand yearly income, and then deducting the whole ſum from what the king would have received, had the civil liſt been left as it ſtood in the reign of his grandfather, that the nation has been benefited in the addition of two millions two hundred thouſand pounds. Hence it appears, inſtead of more money being taken from the annual income, to ſupply the civil liſt expences of his preſent majeſty, than of king George the ſecond, it may be truly ſaid, that by the limitation of that revenue to 800,000*l.* a year, the king has preſented, and the nation received the benefit of 2,200,000*l.* more than it would have done, had the payment remained as indefinite as it did in the preceding reign. And this advantage ſtill continues proportionably to accrue.

But the preſent patriots, being the ſpawn of thoſe who were uniformly rebels to the beſt of kings, and inſtruments of oppreſſion in the hands of the worſt, are ſilent, reſpecting the advantages which the nation has acquired; and clamour inceſſantly againſt the grant above-mentioned, as the moſt oppreſſive that had ever been deviſed, and the moſt injurious to the people.

13. During the reign of king William, the civil liſt was fixed at ſeven hundred thouſand pounds a year; when that ſum would purchaſe double what it will at preſent. This was obtained under the pretence of a penſion, of one hundred thouſand pounds to the queen Dowager; and for ſupporting the houſhold of the duke of Glouceſter. To the queen's uſe he never paid a penny. To the duke of Glouceſter's, fifteen thouſand pounds only. And he refuſed to advance one quarter's revenue

to

to purchaſe plate and furniture for his royal highneſs's uſe. He ſpent it chiefly on Dutchmen and Renegadoes of their native country, on *one female* favourite, and in the exerciſe of that ſort of vice in which he was ſo ſecret; and chiefly in Holland.

14. A ſtanding army is another ſubject of loud complaint againſt his preſent majeſty. At the ſame time, it ſeems altogether irreconcileable with the ſtate of things, to reduce the number of land-forces, when it is conſidered, how greatly the dominions of the crown exceed thoſe which it poſſeſſed at the revolution: And that the ſpirit of rebellion was ſoon manifeſted after his majeſty's aſcent to the throne, not only in this kingdom, but on the continent of America. Muſt it not therefore appear to be an act of inſanity to enter on a reduction of the army? For ſuch is the preſent ſpirit of the patriots and their populace, it cannot reaſonably be called in queſtion, but that the city mob and city apprentices would long ſince have repeated the like outrages which were perpetrated in the reign of king Charles the firſt; have driven his preſent majeſty from his palace, or have committed ſome act of rebellion, even yet more violent againſt him had no ſtanding troops exiſted. Would they not have compelled the parliament to perpetrate whatever they demanded, and once more in civil bloodſhed have brought their ſovereign to the block and ſubverted the conſtitution in church and ſtate? even as it is, they, on one occaſion, attempted violence on lord North. That this is not a chimerical ſuggeſtion is more than probable, from the words of Dr. Prieſtly, their ſpiritual champion. That tender-conſcienced and loyal teacher, in his eſſay on the principles of government p. 38. when

ſpeaking

ſpeaking of the murder of Charles the firſt declares, that "ſuch a tranſaction would have been," which both grammar and ſenſe require to be written *will be*, "an immortal honour to this country, whenever the ſuperſtitious notion (the ſacredneſs of kings) ſhall be obliterated." And if it be not now effectually obliterated, it is not to the ſupineneſs or malignity of him and his brethren, the patriots, that its continuance can be aſcribed. Even Dr. Price, in his appeal to the public, p. 39. in enumerating the cauſes of our preſent evils, introduces that of "giving ſecurity to the Hanover ſucceſſion. This, ſays he, is in truth the fundamental grievance of the kingdom; and that patriotiſm, the firſt object of which is not the removal of it, can be nothing but an impoſture." To expect that ſuch principles will not produce the ſame effects, which they have hitherto done, is to ſuppoſe the order of nature to be abſolutely changed. And will it be more abſurd to ſuppoſe, that the ſeed of an onion will produce a pine-apple, than that ſuch principles, unchecked, will not generate rebellion. Such are the words of theſe reverend ſeekers of the Lord. And will it not embarraſs the unmerciful Tommy Townſhend, and the modeſt Mr. Lee to diſcover any thing in the writings of Dr. Johnſon, or myſelf, ſo nearly approaching to treaſon? and yet, to uſe the words of that *fellow* Lee, "we ſee no notice taken, no complaint made of Books," wherein the principles of regicides and rebels are impiouſly profeſſed and publicly promulgated. A ſtanding army is therefore become indiſpenſibly requiſite. It was to men of their principles and to ſerve their own purpoſes that a ſtanding army was firſt begun, and cauſeleſsly eſtabliſhed in this kingdom;

kingdom; and, in conſequence of their preſent exertion of the ſame principles, it is at length become a neceſſary meaſure that it be continued, in order to prevent their republican purpoſes; and for the ſecurity of his majeſty and the conſtitution. Thus the very forces, which they eſtabliſhed, by an unforeſeen event are become the evident means, of ſuppreſſing their ſeditious principles from being carried into execution.

14. When king William aſcended the throne, a ſtanding army was unknown in theſe realms. It was he began and continued it, during life. It was he, and the Whigs, who, in oppoſition to the Tories, prevented their being diminiſhed below ſeven thouſand forces. And in one year he kept three thouſand men in pay more than the number voted by parliament. It was the Tories who inſiſted on the Dutch guards being ſent home; and on the renegado Frenchmen being diſbanded. All mankind are acquainted with what reluctance the king ſubmitted to this neceſſary act. And when the parliament would not conſent that he ſhould keep his alien guards, which were an eternal reproach to the honour and fidelity of the Engliſh, he ſaid, "if I had a ſon, by God theſe Dutch guards ſhould not quit me."

15. Parliamentary corruption, placemen, and penſioners, conſtitute another charge againſt the preſent reign. *That* corruption is undoubtedly great enough. But from the revolution, to his majeſty's acceſſion to the throne, the Whigs had ſo far effaced all ſenſe of national virtue, that the caſe was, in fact, no longer a corruption ſpread by the miniſtry, among the members of parliament; but a demand of the members to be corrupted by the miniſtry, which would take no denial. For a majority

jority of thoſe delegated defenders of the people's rights, conſidered the revenues of places and penſions as a kind of hereditary right eſtabliſhed by preſcription; and therefore that no miniſter ſhould be permitted to tranſact the national buſineſs, however advantageous it might prove, without their being previouſly obtained by pecuniary emoluments. And ſince we have experimentally found that the excluſion of ſome placemen has not improved the integrity of the houſes, what reaſon have we to believe that, if not a man of that ſort had a ſeat in either houſe, that the parliament would be leſs corrupt, or leſs compliable with the propoſitions of the miniſters? The commiſſioners of the cuſtoms, exciſe, ſtamps, army agents, and a great number of others, are precluded from ſeats in the houſe of commons, as men too much under miniſterial influence. But is the number in favour of court meaſures thereby diminiſhed? would it not be better, according to the preſent and degenerate diſpoſitions of mankind, to have ſuffered theſe men to have remained members; becauſe their ſalaries would then have influenced to nothing more than what is now accompliſhed by others, at a much greater expence? For now two ſets of men are paid for that which might be as well performed by one alone; and the expences ſaved to the people which are now waſted on the latter. When corruption cannot be cured, which, by the practice of the Whigs, has been foſtered and continued through almoſt a whole century; when religion and national integrity, by their encouragement, alſo have been laughed into ſcorn; when all men are convinced that the preſent complainants in parliament have practiſed the ſame corrupt means, when they were in power; and that thoſe who are

not

not in that houſe, are in oppoſition to the ſame meaſures only, becauſe they do not participate in this diſtribution of corruption; were it not better to admit all placemen and penſioners to ſit in the houſe of commons, and thereby at leaſt to ſave the public money; ſince by the uniform experience of eighty-ſix years, every reaſonable expectation of reſtoring public virtue is at end?

To what purpoſe then can annual or triennial parliaments be revived, unleſs the diſpoſitions of men can be changed by their own votes in the houſe of commons? by ſhortening the duration, the price of corruption will increaſe, ſince men will be bought whatever it may be. And if they have but one year's market, they know that the buſineſs of the ſtate cannot proceed without them; and therefore they will ſell their commodity at a higher price. The nation muſt conſequently be taxed for more money; the people be oppreſſed to provide it; and corruption become more egregious than before, the ſole event which is to be expected from annual parliaments. That we have no longer trienial parliaments is owing to the Whigs, thoſe friends of England, who without applying to their conſtituents for a re-election, moſt impudently continued the preceding election from three to ſeven years. It appears from the hiſtory of this kingdom that, in the reign of Edward the ſecond, there were almoſt as many parliaments as years. In that of Richard the ſecond, there were two new parliaments more than the years he reigned; and three in one year. And yet, are theſe times ſuch as any friend to human kind or lover of his country, can wiſh to ſee reſtored? can it be deemed an unwarrantable concluſion, that the preſent men of principles ſo ſimilar to thoſe of the long parliament,

liament, in the reign of Charles the firſt, who alſo roared for triennial parliaments, will, like them alſo, when become a majority, rob the king of his prerogative, and eſtabliſh a parliament that can be prorogued and diſſolved by themſelves alone? are not the rebellious acts of that parliament ſuch as they yearn to imitate? and would they not at once, by a like law, not only deprive the king of his prerogative, in the antecedent reſpects; but rob the people of their right of a *general election*, by perpetuating themſelves for ever? ſuch were the tranſactions in thoſe days, when they had the effrontery to pretend, that they took arms in defence of the people's rights and privileges, and for the king himſelf, againſt whom they waged a war and ſought to ſlay: ſuch they will not proclaim themſelves to be, whenever they can find their power is become predominant in the commons.

15. The prince of Orange, in his declaration, aſſerts, "that his expedition was intended for no other deſign but to have a free and lawful parliament." The firſt inſtance of his ſincerity was to call together thoſe who had been members of any parliaments in the reign of Charles the ſecond. This proceeding was, in fact, a poſitive interdiction, not only of all thoſe who had been members in the reign of James the ſecond, but of every other ſubject, except the mayor, aldermen, and the deputies of the common council of London. Of the members, as it was foreſeen, thoſe, who had been for excluding king James from the throne, made the largeſt number. And we are told by Tindal, "the *prince* thought, that beſides the ſuffrages of the peers, it was proper to be authorized by others, which might *paſs for thoſe of the people*." And thoſe men, ſo ſelected and convened, addreſſed the

the prince to take upon him the adminiſtration of public affairs. And thus this aſſembly, in the place of a parliament, was elected by the prince of Orange alone, on a ſubject the moſt important to a ſtate. One hundred and ſixty men, with the mayor, aldermen, and deputies of London, were conſidered as a majority of the people of England; and the adminiſtration of the nation was imparted to him without the leaſt application for the conſent of the reſt of the nation. A convention was called by the prince of Orange, the members of it were elected, and they placed the crown on the heads of him and the princeſs Mary, and excluded king James, without conſulting the people on that moſt momentous tranſaction. It was now that parliamentary corruption, but little practiſed in the antecedent reigns, was ſpread with amazing zeal and rapidity; and inſtead of calling free parliaments, none had hitherto been ſummoned, in which a tenth part of pecuniary influence had been exerted to ſupplant the freedom of elections. Burnet ſays he complained of this corruption to the king. His majeſty anſwered that it was *impoſſible* to be prevented. Such being the caſe, at that time, I imagine that eighty-ſix years of ſucceſſive corruption hath not changed that *impoſſibility* into a thing *practicable*, at preſent. For, by men of like principles with the preſent patriots, from 1688, to the acceſſion of his preſent majeſty, that luxuriant plant hath been ſo carefully manured and watered; hath taken ſuch deep root; and brought forth fruit in ſuch abundance, it appears to be as eaſy to aboliſh the exiſtence of parliaments, as to eradicate the corruption of them. And from an unremitting experience, is there not the greateſt reaſon to believe, with the revival of annual parliaments, and with

the virtues of John Wilkes, eſq; added to thoſe of the preſent patriots, in and out of the commons, that the torrent of corruption will ſtill perſevere in its wonted rapidity?

16. The ſale of places, and frauds committed by thoſe in office, conſtitute an accuſation of the preſent miniſters. I can recollect but one inſtance in which the former hath been brought to proof. And on that occaſion the charge was refuted by a verdict of twelve jurors, in a court of law. Of the other charge the ſole evidence hitherto appears to conſiſt in nothing but the clamours of the patriots and the populace.

16. In the reign of king William, Burnet tells us, that places were ſet to ſale by the Whigs; the fleet was victualled with unwholſome food; the army in Ireland left unfurniſhed with every thing neceſſary; artillery, horſes, carriages, bread, medicines, &c. The duke of Leeds, Trevor, ſpeaker of the commons, Guy, Craggs, and a number of others equally culpable, were impeached for bribery. The parliament was then prorogued, in order to preſerve theſe ſcandalous offenders from puniſhment. And an act of indemnity was ſoon paſſed to reſcind the means of bringing them to juſtice. Beſides which, moſt egregious abuſes, ill practices, and intolerable exactions, by colonels and agents, were perpetrated on the officers and common men. And among the numerous frauds, that of falſe endorſements on exchequer bills was one, by which vaſt ſums were amaſſed by men in office. The perpetrators of all theſe heinous crimes, were altogether unnoticed, or but ſlightly puniſhed.

17. Another cauſe of murmuring is the behaviour of the ſoldiery in their quarters, which exiſts

in

in clamour only, as far as it has hitherto been proved.

17. In the reign of king William, the officers and ſoldiers extorted ſubſiſtence money from thoſe on whom they were quartered, and to this violence they were chiefly induced by the frauds, and withholding of their ſubſiſtence money, by their colonels and agents.

18. The diminution of the gold coin of the kingdom was of late become ſo notorious, that it was abſolutely neceſſary to put a ſtop to that iniquity. This was done by aſcertaining the weights at which each piece ſhould paſs, according to the reign in which it was ſtruck. This moſt reaſonable proceeding was, nevertheleſs, a cauſe of prodigious outcry; although a reform were abſolutely indiſpenſible. The event has proved the excellence of the meaſure; the evil is remedied, and the nation has been put to the expence of 25,000*l.* only for a new coinage.

18. A like diminution of the coin was ſuffered to take place, ſo long in the reign of king William, that 1,200,000*l.* (Burnet ſays it coſt 2,200,000*l.*) were raiſed in parliament, by a tax on windows, for ſupplying the deficiency of clipt money. Five *per cent.* was given as a reward for bringing in unclipt money; and three-pence an ounce for all wrought plate above its real value, and the uſe of plate was prohibited in public houſes. Notwithſtanding all this mode of proceeding, which would at this day be pronounced an act of arbitrary power, the diſtreſs occaſioned by this recalling of the coin was ſo great, that there was not money ſufficient for the payment of ſervants, labourers, and others, who were in weekly want of their wages. Government tallies and deben-

tures were at forty, fifty, and ſixty, exchequer, and even bank bills at twenty *per cent.* diſcount. Such is the infinite diſparity between the meaſures taken by the miniſtry, in the reign of the glorious king William, and by thoſe in this of his preſent majeſty.

19. Are not the marriages of their royal highneſſes the dukes of Glouceſter and Cumberland, unprecedented inſtances of two brothers engaging in matrimonial contracts, without previouſly declaring their intentions to him who was their brother and their ſovereign? Precedents in this kingdom, without reſpect to their good or evil tendencies, are too frequently conſidered as authorities adequate to a juſtification for ſimilar behaviour on ſubſequent occaſions, as if the ſole circumſtance of preceding could impart a ſanction to all that might follow of a like nature. I believe if Cain had ſlain his brother Abel, in England, the preſent patriots would have brought that fratricide as an argument againſt the juſtice of his preſent majeſty, had he permitted one brother to be put to death for the murder of the other, provided it could promote their conſcientious purpoſes. His majeſty, on the antecedent events, having conſidered the numerouſneſs of his children, and the ill effects which might ariſe from intermarriages between the royal family and thoſe of his ſubjects, entered on a reſolution of preventing ſuch ill effects by anticipation; and before it could have the leaſt appearance of anſwering any intention againſt any prince deſcended from his grandfather.

It was therefore enacted, that no perſon lineally deſcended from that king, ſhould legally contract a marriage, without the previous conſent of his majeſty, his heirs, or ſucceſſors. But if any ſuch de-

deſcendant, above the age of twenty-five years, ſhall perſiſt in ſuch intention of matrimony, upon giving notice to the privy council of ſuch intention, after the expiration of one year, he or ſhe ſhall be permitted to marry; notwithſtanding the king may not have conſented to it; unleſs the parliament, during that time, ſhall expreſsly declare their diſapprobation of ſuch intended marriage. It is not eaſy to ſuggeſt a method that at once ſo juſtly unites the claims of national felicity with thoſe of nature. Such princes are prohibited from marrying, without the king's conſent, only until they become well informed of the conſequences which may probably enſue ſuch contracts. They are then free from their ſovereign's controul, and left to the two houſes of parliament, without his aſſent required to their determinations. If the marriage appear to be reaſonable, it will certainly be approved; if not, it reſts on the houſes to juſtify their refuſal. And yet, ſo propitiouſly promiſing to preclude innumerable ill effects, as this act indiſputably is, it was not the leſs an object of patriotic calumny.

19. Such an act, as the preceding, could find no place in the reign of king William. Queen Mary had no children, nor did I ever hear that Elizabeth Villiers, or any favourite, male or female, was ever ſuſpected of being, in a breeding ſtate, from any intercourſe with that prince, biſhop Burnet excepted. And even that ſuſpicion of the prelate was entertained by himſelf alone. The biſhop, in whom credulity and truth were as diſtant from each other as the two poles, paid an implicit obedience to the dictates of the former, and totally diſregarded thoſe of the latter. To his honour, however, it muſt be allowed, that he never diminiſhed his native ſtock of verity, thro'

the

the practice of his life. For, in all his relations, he conſtantly made uſe of *that* only which is either *more* or *leſs* than the *truth*; and hence, having never touched the truth itſelf, he went out of the world poſſeſſed of the whole original ſtock with which he came into it. As to his credulity, although it were daily waſted to the bones, yet, like the liver of Prometheus, what was devoured in the day, was regenerated in the night; and it never ſuffered a real leſſening to the hour of his expiration. In conſequence of this profligate credulity this right reverend œconomiſt of veracity being occaſionally indiſpoſed, by an advertiſement was informed where a certain quack doctor might be found, who by *caſting* his lordſhip's water, could not only diſcover his diſeaſe, but ſend him a cure, without the intervention of a perſonal enquiry into his complaints. Credulity ſeized on the occaſion, and a ſervant was diſpatched to this quack, with a phial of his holy water. But ſuch were the effects of fate, that neither the ſanctity of the biſhop's manners, nor the preſervation of his precious health, could prevent the phial from being broken in the carrying. The ſervant, who poſſeſſed, at leaſt, as much ſenſe as his maſter, thought that the water of one perſon might prove as good for the preſent purpoſe, as that of another, and being apprehenſive of being chidden alſo, if the accident were diſcovered, bought a phial, and knowing that water, freſh made, would create ſome ſuſpicion in the doctor, entered a beer houſe, and deſired that the phial might be filled with ſome water that had been made during the night. The good woman of the houſe, who was, it ſeems, breeding, filled it with her own, and away trudged the ſervant to the phyſical inſpector of urine.

On

On his return, the biſhop cried out, "Weel Mon, What kens the doctor of my urine?" My lord, ſays Sandy, "after meckle leuking on the water, he e'en told me, the perſon who made that water is with bairn." "Ah! geud God, cried his lordſhip, I always told his majeſty what it would at length come to. ‡ *I myſelf ſaw a great deal of this management, for I was then at court.*"

20. The diſpleaſure againſt the princes for their marriages, was another article of reſentment againſt his majeſty, by the patriots, who preſume to cenſure his private as much as his public conduct. But certainly no ſovereign hath ever ſhewn ſo little diſlike on ſo unexampled an occaſion. It is true, they do not appear at court, and there it ends. In all other reſpects, no mark of reſentment is ſhewn either by his majeſty or the queen.

20. King William and queen Mary reſented the application of the princeſs Anne to parliament, for fixing her revenue, when ſhe ſo juſtly declined the dependence on the generoſity of a Dutchman for the payment of her income. This behaviour was ſo offenſive to king William and queen Mary, who ſuſpected that this application had proceeded from the advice of the dutcheſs of Marlborough, that

‡ As the writer of this account had no other authority than his own aſſertion, to authenticate the above paſſage, and as, in all probability, he was not born till thirty years after the event could have happened, it recurred to him that the truth of it might poſſibly be called in queſtion. Notwithſtanding this ſingle circumſtance, he ſtill expects that it will obtain the credit which it deſerves. Since it is to the full as practicable for the writer to have been at the court of London, before he was born, as it was for Burnet to be at Whitehall, before he left Scotland. And yet, on ſuch kind of evidence, much of his lordſhip's hiſtory depends.

that they ordered the princeſs to diſmiſs her from her ſervice: and becauſe ſhe would not comply with this injunction, ſhe was forbidden the court. In this diſunion the ſiſters remained; and the pious queen Mary ſet out to anſwer for this want of natural affection, in another world, without deſiring to be reconciled to her only ſiſter in this.

21. Another modeſt charge of the patriots againſt his Majeſty is, that of violating the grants made in royal charters to the Americans, by the preceding kings of England; and in preſuming to extend into the colonies the legiſlative right of taxation by the parliament of Great Britain; which, as theſe ſubjects aſſert, is done with intent to enſlave the *good people* of America. But will theſe Americans and their confederates, in this kingdom, uniformly allow, that the royal prerogative can, by grants, conſtitutionally annihilate the authority of the Britiſh legiſlature? will not this be to acknowledge and ſupport, that a more exceſſive power remains at preſent in the crown than was extirpated by the bill of rights? by that bill, the king is inhibited from ſuſpending or diſpenſing with laws already made; but by the prerogative, for which the patriots and the Americans contend, the parliamentary power of making laws, in this realm, reſpecting America, is not only ſuſpended and diſpenſed with, but abſolutely annihilated by the king. Becauſe, by his prerogative, he can reſcind it from parliament, and bequeath it to the colonies. Is this doctrine coincident with that which is ſo vehemently urged againſt exerting the prerogative-royal, even to the preſervation of the people from ſtarving? But, to men of their principles, every exceſs of that power is lawful; and the leaſt legal exertion of it a violence, as each of them may quadrate with their deſigns.

ſigns. They never have allowed, nor ever will allow, any meaſure to be juſt or unjuſt, but as it correſponds with, or oppoſes their purpoſes. Has not the legiſlature aboliſhed the ancient rights of the church, of ſuit and ſervice in the field and at the courts of kings, and barons, of marriage, ward, ſoccage and villain ſervice; together with a multiplicity of others, ſo ſolemnly granted, in magna charta, by compact between the ſovereign and his ſubjects, conſecrated by the ſolemn rights and ſanction of religion, and confirmed more than thirty times in parliament? and, were not theſe amazing changes accompliſhed by the legiſlature, in proportion as the progreſſive alteration in manners, the augmentation of riches, and the welfare of the ſtate required them? But it ſeems the grants of kings, to the ſubjects in America, are to be held more ſacred and inviolate than the great charter of England. And the power of the two houſes, added to that of the ſovereign, on the preſent ſtate of circumſtances in America, ſo different from that which exiſted when their charters were originally granted, is to remain inert, and ſupinely ſee the colonies diſmembered from their mother country. It ſhould ſeem a parliament can lawfully do every thing in Great Britain, and nothing in America. The king can neither revoke his grants, nor the parliament alter them, whatever may be the emergencies which demand it.

In objection to the right of taxing them, by parliament, they anſwer, that they have an excluſive privilege by charter, to tax themſelves, by their own aſſemblies, by whom it can alone be equitably done. But do theſe grants expreſsly exclude the legiſlative authority of this kingdom from making laws to levy money in America? and if they do, is there

an Engliſhman uninfatuated with the preſent patriotiſm, or unactuated by ſiniſter motives, who would not exclaim againſt the validity of ſuch a pretended right in the crown? would not even theſe patriotic malcontents be then the firſt to roar againſt kings, for infracting the rights, ſubverting the liberties, deſtroying the conſtitution, and enſlaving the people? but now it ſeems right, liberty and conſtitution are all to be preſerved by ſuſtaining that very prerogative-royal, which, on other occaſions, they ſo much affect to execrate and confine. Innumerable are the charters granted by kings to corporations in this kingdom, by which they are authoriſed to levy money for their own uſes; but are theſe corporations, by theſe charters, protected from the payment of parliamentary impoſts?

Have not the Americans, by their charters, the right alſo of making laws for themſelves? will not the ſame arguments, therefore, which are urged in favour of their diſobedience to taxation, be equally coercive in every other legiſlative ordinance? and from thence, will it not as logically reſult, that the parliament of Great Britain has not the leaſt right to enact ſuch laws, as may, in the leaſt degree, or in any inſtance effect the Americans in their ſeveral provinces? and then, will not that exemption amount to an abſolute independency on the legiſlative authority of this realm; a concluſion, which, I ſhould think, can hardly be warranted by the conſtitutions, either of Great Britain, or of the colonies.

Beſides the preceding objection of theſe republican malcontents, to comply with the acts which are made, reſpecting taxations on them in the provinces, they alledge, in their defence alſo, that they

they have no right of electing members; and therefore are not repreſented in the houſe of commons, none to ſuperintend their concerns, and to aſſiſt in laying taxes by their own conſent, as it is the undoubted privilege of all thoſe ſubjects who reſide in Great Britain: but in this they muſt conſciouſly offer what they know to be untrue. For in this predicament, they ſtand exactly on a level with nine parts in ten of the ſubjects of this kingdom, who have no elective right. But the rights of election, and of being repreſented, are diſtinct things. For the inſtant the members are elected by the *few*, they become the repreſentatives of *all*. Unleſs this were the caſe, all thoſe ſubjects, who have copy-hold eſtates to any value, money in the funds, or on mortgages to any amount whatever, who annually trade and manufacture for great ſums, as well as innumerable others, who have not freeholds for forty ſhillings a year, or are entitled to vote by freedom, burgage tenure, or other qualification of the ſeveral cities and towns, which ſends members to parliament, are not repreſented. A concluſion to which, I imagine, no Briton will accede. The Americans, therefore, although they be without the right of election, are nevertheleſs poſſeſſed of that of being repreſented, as fully as that great majority of non-electors who inhabit this iſland. Being therefore, in a like condition they ought, for that reaſon to pay the like obedience to the acts of this legiſlature, with thoſe who dwell in England, and are not entitled to the privilege of election.

Should this vaſt majority of non-electing conſtituents preſume to withhold the taxes, which are impoſed on them, for the preceding reaſons, which they may as juſtly urge as the Americans, would

theſe be arguments ſufficient to protect them from a compulſory payment? the counties palatine of Cheſter and Durham had, and now have laws peculiar to themſelves. The former ſent no members to parliament, till late in the reign of Henry the eighth; the latter, in that of Charles the ſecond. Were they before they ſent members, without the reach of parliamentary taxation? were not their grants as valid, and their objections as reaſonably to be made, as by the Americans; but did that avail them?

Before the American ſtamp act was made, what inſtance is there to be found, that theſe reſtiff ſubjects conceived the idea of not being repreſented in parliament? did they ever abſtain from applying thereto, on all occaſions, which might ſerve their purpoſes and promote their intereſt? during the laſt war, when they boaſted to expel the French from Canada, if arms were ſent them, and when that requeſt was complied with, it was found, by experience, that all their fanatic vauntings expired in wind; and that the Canadians, who were not a tenth part of their number, would have driven them into the Atlantic ocean. On this diſtreſs did they not conceive themſelves to be repreſented in parliament, and apply for an army to ſave them from deſtruction? and was not that ſuccour ſent and ſupported, at an immenſe expence, to this kingdom? By this act alone, were they not preſerved from the hands of their enemies? and now they preſume to reſiſt the Britiſh right of taxing them, by that very legiſlature, from whom they fought and received their temporal ſalvation. Such hath been, is, and ever will be the thankleſs returns of thoſe men, from whoſe hearts it would be exceſſively more difficult to eradicate ingratitude

tude, than to diveſt arſenic of the power of poiſoning.

It ſhould ſeem then, that thoſe graceleſs ſubjects conſider the people of England as their ſlaves, to labour, and to find men and money for their ſervice and defence: and that they are our maſters, at full liberty to raiſe or withhold either of them as they pleaſe, whatever may be the emergencies that may happen in this part of the world. In fact, we are to be at all the expence of treaſure and of blood, and they to reap the advantage of it, without contributing one ſhilling, or one man, towards the demands of either of them. Would not this inſolence, if indulged, be adequate to the folly of toſſing up a halfpenny on the ridiculous conditions, that, by heads, the *Americans* win, and by tails, *we* in England loſe. If the ſpirit of a Briton and a loyal ſubject can bear this inſult on his underſtanding, on his property, and on his right of preſerving life in common with all other his majeſty's ſubjects, their ſouls are not made, at preſent, of the ſame eſtimable materials with thoſe of their anceſtors. I will appeal to the common ſenſe of all thoſe, who are acquainted with the principles of thoſe trans-Atlantic ſectaries, whether, in times of war, without the legiſlative obligation of the parliament, they would raiſe a ſhilling that was not to be ſolely applied to their own particular advantages? are theſe the ſubjects who are to be permitted to reſiſt the laws of Britain, and to be indulged with raiſing their own taxes on all emergencies? to them is his majeſty to apply, by requiſition, for ſupplies to be levied at their option? and is the legiſlature of Great Britain to remain inexertive of her conſtitutional rights, and to be ſo flagitiouſly treated by ſuch rebellious ingrates? Britons,

tons, Britons, if you have loſt all ſenſation for the honour of your king and country, feel for your lives and properties at leaſt; and ſuffer not yourſelves to be thus audaciouſly inſulted by thoſe Americans, who dare to treat you as men ſubſervient to their purpoſes, and to fix on you alone the whole expence of peace and war. Will you tamely behold thoſe enemies to your conſtitution, to withhold themſelves from danger, and their money from contributing to the general cauſe at their pleaſure? ſuch, however, is the deſpicable ſtate to which the preſent patriots, thoſe protectors of your rights and liberties, are labouring to reduce you! can ſuch men be the friends of their country? but ſuch hath been the audacious inſolence of theſe American ſectaries; for ſuch alone are engaged in this rebellious oppoſition to the king that even the right of taxing the Americans, by a Britiſh parliament, is no longer the object in diſpute. For ſince the legiſlature thought proper to enact, that teas, carried to America, ſhould, on landing, be ſubject to a ſmall duty, the ſtate of the caſe is changed entirely. It is no longer a conteſt, whether they ſhall be taxed by parliament; but, whether goods, exported from Great Britain, ſhall be landed in America. The payment of this tax was altogether optional in the people of that continent. For, unleſs it were conſumed, no revenue could be derived from the impoſt: and every man was left at will to be a conſumer or not. But ſuch were the ſentiments which theſe diſloyal ſubjects entertained of their own integrity, and ſuch their confidence in each other, that conſcious of their internal rottenneſs of ſoul, they were convinced, that ſhould that commodity be permitted to be ſet on ſhore, their intereſted patriotiſm

triotiſm would not prevent its being conſumed. The Boſtonians, therefore, diſregarding the claims of common honeſty, as well as law, if any ſhare of the former virtue did then remain among them, boarded the ſhip by force; rifled the cargoe; threw it into the river, and thus committed felony. Such was the unpardonable contempt which they manifeſted to the laws of Great Britain. Theſe are the men who ſtill proteſt they are meritorious and loyal ſubjects; and who are encouraged and defended by the patriots in this their unexampled outrage.

The event has evinced that the magiſtrates of Boſton either had not the power or the inclination to put the laws in execution againſt thoſe rebellious plunderers; the latter of which is well known to be the truth. That the governor was not armed with powers, nor poſſeſſed of ſufficient authority to compel them to it, is an indubitable fact. And yet, according to patriotic and preſbyterian doctrine, this moſt attrocious inſult on the legiſlative body of this kingdom is to be left entirely to the cognizance of their own magiſtrates, who it is certain, will pay no more attention to it, than neceſſity ſhall compel them to. Would not that, in fact, be adequate to a plenary indulgence in the crime? Not a felon of them has been apprehended: and if ten thouſand of them had been tried for ten thouſand murders, committed in that or the like tranſaction, they would have been acquitted to a man with exultation, and with triumph over juſtice. Are theſe men with impunity to riot in their outrages; to remain unamenable to all courts of law; and, be ſecured from condign puniſhment, becauſe they and their magiſtrates are equally excited by the ſame rebellious principles? do they deſerve to enjoy

joy the protection of the laws againſt thieves, in this kingdom, who are advocates for ſuch criminals in America?

Are thoſe audacious men, who have thus forcibly committed, not only felony, but high crimes, and miſdemeanours, if not treaſon againſt the ſtate, to receive no chaſtiſement from the legiſlature? is not the ſanction of the laws which was violated by force, to be reſtored by force legally eſtabliſhed to that end? but lenient and temporiſing meaſures are, alone, to be adopted and purſued, ſay the modeſt patriots. The Romans never temporiſed but once. They were ſpeedily convinced of that folly, abſtained from all repetition of a ſimilar miſtake, and, by that reſolution, ſubdued the world. Half meaſures deſtroy the beſt deſigns. The miniſter, on occaſions like the preſent, that deliberates is loſt. Not only he, but even the dignity of the crown, and the happineſs of the people ſink therewith. But I truſt that an ill-timed and injudicious lenity will not avert the ſucceſs of ſo juſt and ſo national a cauſe. For there are times in which the ſtrict application of a proper power can alone preſerve a nation's welfare.

In no inſtance of outrageous violation of the legiſlative authority, hath ſuch an indulgence been ſhewn to criminals, ſo egregiouſly offending. In return for all this violence, what has hitherto proved to be the infliction on the perpetrators? the Boſtonions are prohibited, by law, from exporting, and from importing, in the port of Boſton only, with penalties annexed to tranſgreſſions of that law; which however, does not extend to the prohibition of fuel. Another place is appointed for the meeting of their aſſemblies, and a port alſo is appropriated to the purpoſes of navigation.

And

And ſuch offenders, as it is well known will not be treated with the juſtice of that puniſhment which their crimes demand, may be now ſent hither to be tried, in the courts of this kingdom, in which there is no ſhadow of pretence that the laws will be unjuſtly carried into execution. Can the hiſtory of all ages produce one inſtance of ſo lenient a proceeding againſt ſuch egregious offenders? added to this, a general and ſome troops, with a few ſhips of war, are ordered to prevent the like outrages for the future; and to provide that theſe acts of the legiſlature be not inſulted and rendered effete, by a like rebellious action as the former were. This is the whole exertion of legiſlative authority which has hitherto been enacted, relative to the Boſtonian rebels, on which ſuch a tumultuous outcry of infracted charters, and intended ſlavery is bellowed through the realm, againſt his majeſty, his parliament, and his miniſters. Did either Cromwell or the glorious king William poſſeſs the ſupreme power at this time, the former, who knew the inſidious diſpoſitions of the preſbyterians; and the latter, who never failed ſeverely to inflict thoſe with puniſhment, who oppoſed his will, would not permit theſe rebels to perſevere in ſuch reſiſtance, and eſcape on ſuch eaſy terms? would they not then have reaſon to lament the want of that mercy which they now decry as criminal, in their ſovereign, on the throne.

But, in order to obviate all objection againſt the king, his parliament and miniſters, reſpecting the conduct which has been adopted and purſued in the preceding inſtance, I will take up the principles and opinions of thoſe patriots, relative to the ſovereigns of Great Britain and their miniſters; ſuppoſe, for a while, that his majeſty is no-

thing more than a chief magiſtrate and truſtee for the people; and that his miniſters are obliged to adviſe and execute that alone which is juſt, and moſt likely to be advantageous to the whole community, whether in Britain, America, or other place whatever.

Is it not an invariable maxim of ſound polity, that all thoſe, who are ſubjects to the ſame ſtate, ſhould be equally obedient to the acts of her legiſlature? can there be any thing more juſt than that all ſuch ſhould contribute their proper proportion of ſupplies, both in men and money, for ſuſtaining all national exigencies? and is it not the indiſpenſable duty of ſuch a king and of his miniſters to apply to the ſupreme legiſlative power, and to obtain ſuch acts as may compel thoſe revolters from their conſtitutional allegiance, who would withhold themſelves from ſuch duties, to become obedient to the laws, and contribute to the ſupport and welfare of the ſtate? are not theſe the meaſures which his majeſty and his miniſters have purſued? could ſuch conduct have been omitted without the juſt charge of inattention and neglect on a chief magiſtrate, and truſtee of the Britiſh people? are Great Britain and Ireland alone to raiſe the national ſupplies, and the Americans to be left untaxed by the Britiſh parliament, would not that partiality to the latter be an oppreſſion on the former; and his majeſty, on patriotic principles, be a moſt delinquent magiſtrate, and faithleſs truſtee? hence then, whether the king be conſidered as he conſtitutionally *is*, or according to the ſentiments of patriots and ſectaries, what reaſonable objection can be framed againſt his preſent meaſures in Boſton? ſhall the Americans contribute their treaſure, or not; determine what ſhall be imported

ported from this kingdom to his majeſty's colonies; and exported from thence, as they pleaſe, and be indulged in this flagitious breach of allegiance? and laſtly, will you Britons, and Hibernians, who are loyal ſubjects, be tamely and alone doomed to every expence, in men and money, which the kingdom may require, whilſt the Americans are exempted from both? join, therefore, with chearfulneſs and reſolution, to ſupport the undoubted rights of your ſovereign and yourſelves; exert your endeavours to ſuppreſs their rebellious proceedings in America; and treat, with honeſt indignation, all thoſe in theſe kingdoms, who juſtify their inſults, and defend their cauſe, as enemies to the conſtitution, to your ſovereign, and to the honour and welfare of the Britiſh realms in Europe. For, in whatever light the conduct of your king, his parliament, and miniſtry, may be repreſented by deſigning men, to the eyes of integrity, on this occaſion, their actions ill appear to be deſerving the utmoſt applauſe a loyal and a happy people can beſtow.

21. In the reign of king William, there ſeems to be nothing ſimilar to the preceding conduct. The honour and the intereſt of England, during that time, appear not to have been attended to with much ſincerity. His exertions were to obtain money from his Engliſh ſubjects, to maintain the honour and the intereſts of the Dutch; by charter, to ſurrender the rights of the whole nation into the hands and tyranny of a trading company; and tamely to ſuffer his Britiſh ſubjects to be driven from their American ſettlements, by the Spaniards, when the intereſts of the Dutch required it.

22. Another moſt atrocious accuſation againſt his majeſty hath been diligently, and with frequent repetition promulged through his whole domini-

ons. It is nothing leſs than that of having broken his coronation oath, in aſſenting to the act for making more effectual proviſion for the government of Quebec. Let me tranſcribe this oath, that the audacious injuſtice of this calumny may be clearly ſhewn to the world.

It is, " that his majeſty ſolemnly promiſes and ſwears to govern the people of this kingdom of Great Britain and the dominions thereto belonging, according to the ſtatutes in parliament agreed on, and the laws and cuſtoms of the ſame."

Is not this Quebec bill a ſtatute agreed on in parliament, and are not the laws and cuſtoms of the Canadians thoſe by which they are to be governed? where then is the breach in this inſtance? nevertheleſs, on this account, amazing clamours have been raiſed, as if this law were intended to extirpate all trials by juries: than which nothing can be leſs true. At the requeſt of the Canadians, their civil cauſes are to be adjudged, according to the laws and cuſtoms which have always exiſted among them; and from which it was impracticable to deviate, without endangering, by an infinity of litigious purſuits, the claims, titles, and ſecurities by which their properties had been hitherto ſecured.

But reſpecting the proceedings, in criminal law, " it is enacted, that the ſame ſhall continue to be adminiſtered, and ſhall be obſerved, as law, in the province of Quebec, as well in the *deſcription* and *quality* of the offence, as in the *method* of *proſecution* and *trial*; and the puniſhments and forfeitures thereby inflicted, to the excluſion of every other rule of criminal law, or mode of proceeding thereon, which did or might prevail in the ſaid province, before the year of our lord 1764."

Thus

Thus the penal law of England and trial by *juries*, which the patriots aſſert to be aboliſhed, is, by this very act, eſtabliſhed in Canada, at the deſire of the people who knew the benefits and advantages reſulting from their uſe; for like reaſons, as the former laws and mode of trial of the Canadians were preſerved. Are *juries* then aboliſhed in Quebec, when the ſame method of trial is preſerved, as in the criminal law of England? is arbitrary power extended, either in penal or civil cauſes, when in both inſtances, the inclinations of the Canadian ſubjects are complied with? from what motive then did this notorious calumny of annihilating *juries* and eſtabliſhing *ſlavery* in Quebec proceed? from that inſatiable luſt of falſifying in the preſbyterians and other ſectaries. "For, to reproach their ſovereign with lying aſſeverations, is inſeperable from ſuch men, ſo intimately is the ſpirit of falſehood amalgamated with the droſs of which they are compoſed, that divide them, as far as matter is diviſible, and a lie ſhall be found in every atom."

The next article is "that the king, to his power, cauſe the law and juſtice in mercy to be executed in all his judgements." And this obligation, it ſhould ſeem, according to the humanity of patriots, his Majeſty has obſerved with a criminal exceſs.

The laſt article is, "that the king, to the utmoſt of his power, will maintain the laws of God; the true profeſſion of the Goſpel; and the proteſtant reformed religion, as by law eſtabliſhed: and will preſerve unto the biſhops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all ſuch rights and privileges, as do, or ſhall by law appertain unto them, or any of them."

Let me now enquire, whether any thing contained in the Quebec act be repugnant to the pre-

ceding article of the coronation oath. Do theſe propagators of falſehood conceive that, by this article of his coronation oath, his majeſty is obliged to maintain the church of England, as the only true profeſſion of the goſpel; and the proteſtant religion, by law eſtabliſhed, through all his dominions, whether they be ſuch as he poſſeſſed when he took that oath, or ſince acquired by conqueſt? if that be their idea, preſbyterianiſm muſt be extirpated in Scotland; the Roman Catholic religion, in Minorca; mahometaniſm, and the religion of the Hindoos in Bengal, and the Carnatic. Can all this be inferred from the word *maintain?* it was never meant to be more than ſupporting the church of England, where it was then eſtabliſhed, and is not this indiſputably evinced by the ſubſequent particular? "that he will preſerve to the biſhops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their care, all ſuch rights and privileges as do, or ſhall, by law, appertain unto them." Are the churches and temples of the dominions out of England committed to the epiſcopal care? In this inſtance, then, is there the minuteſt cauſe for that atrocious calumny of infracted faith, reſpecting the coronation oath?

In fact, the malignity, the falſehood, the ignorance, or a combination of all theſe qualities, have either blinded the intellects of patriots and preſbyterians. or prevented their acknowledging, that *popery* and the *Roman Catholic religion* are not neceſſarily conjoined. For certain it is, that the diſcipline of a church may be changed; the ſupremacy and juriſdiction imparted to another head; and yet, the articles of faith, the doctrine, the mode of worſhip, and the forms of prayer, may remain unaltered. Such was the real ſtate of things, when

Harry

Harry the eighth had finiſhed the reformation, as far as he intended it. At that time, the papal power was totally extinct in England; and the Roman Catholic remained to be the eſtabliſhed religion. In this manner, it now exiſts in Canada, and a reformation is begun, in that province, by his preſent majeſty, by means as laudable, juſt, and humane, as the former was replete with the oppoſite qualities.

But let this act, reſpecting popery, ſpeak for itſelf. " And for the more perfect ſecurity and eaſe of the minds of the inhabitants of the ſaid province, it is hereby declared, that his majeſty's ſubjects, profeſſing the religion of the church of Rome, of, and in, the ſaid province of Quebec, may have, hold, and enjoy, the free exerciſe of the religion of the church of Rome, *ſubject to the king's ſupremacy*, declared and eſtabliſhed by an act made in the firſt year of the reign of queen Elizabeth, over all the dominions and countries which then did, or hereafter ſhould belong, to the imperial crown of this realm: and that the clergy of the ſaid church may hold, receive and enjoy, their accuſtomed dues and rights, with reſpect to ſuch *perſons* only as ſhall *profeſs* the ſaid *religion*."

Hence, is it not evident, that the *king's ſupremacy* is eſtabliſhed in Canada, and the *papal* aboliſhed? And, by the act of Elizabeth, above referred to, all eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction is annexed to the crown; and neither the pope, nor other foreign potentates, can exerciſe any power or authority in this kingdom. And thus his majeſty is equally the ſupreme head of the church of Rome, in Canada, as he is of the proteſtant church, in England, and of preſbytery, in Scotland. On thoſe terms, theſe catholics can only have, hold,

and enjoy the free exercise of their religion; and then only, in such a manner, that no protestant is obliged to pay one farthing of the accustomed dues and rights which formerly appertained to the Roman Catholic clergy, and which the catholics must continue to pay. In order to enjoy this toleration also, they are obliged to take the following oath. "I A. B. do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to his majesty king George, and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all traiterous conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his person, crown, and dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose, and make known to his majesty, his heirs, and successors, all treasons and traiterous conspiracies, and attempts which I shall know to be against him, or any of them; and all this I do swear, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation, and renouncing all pardons and dispensations from any power or person whomsoever to the contrary. So help me God."

Hence, it is indisputable, that every Canadian, taking this oath, doth solemnly depose all that can be desired, to bind him to the defence of the king, and all that is requisite to be renounced, respecting the pope, and other potentates. His allegiance is as far acknowledged and secured to his majesty, as the sacredness of an oath can ascertain it. And this oath is not to be refused, but under the subsequent penalty; "that every person who shall neglect or refuse to take the said oath, beforementioned, shall incur, and be liable to the same penalties, forfeitures, disabilities, and incapacities, as he would have incurred, and been liable to, for neglecting or refusing to take the oath required by the

the ſaid ſtatute, paſſed in the firſt year of the reign of queen Elizabeth." Theſe penalties, forfeitures, &c. are, "that all offenders ſhall be out of the king's protection; forfeit their lands and goods; be impriſoned and ranſomed at the king's pleaſure; and, if not to be found, they are to be outlawed."

Such are the conditions, on which alone the Canadians can enjoy their religion, and hold their lands and poſſeſſions; and even from theſe the religious orders and communities are excepted. In this manner, convents, both of men and women, muſt inſenſibly decline. No more of either ſex can be ſecluded in ſuch retreats; becauſe no means of ſuſtenance will remain for ſuch perſons. At the ſame time, with this proviſion to ſuppreſs monaſteries, all due encouragement is given for proteſtants to ſettle in that country. Since his majeſty "can make ſuch proviſion, out of the reſt of the accuſtomed dues and rights of the catholic clergy, as may ſuffice for the maintenance of proteſtant divines of the church of England, as he ſhall think expedient."

Such are the excellent inſtitutions, contained in this law, reſpecting the Canadians. Popery is aboliſhed. The bringing of any bull, order, or other pretended authority, from the papal ſee, or other ſtate, is attended with a præmunire. The Roman Catholic religion is ſubjected to the king's ſupremacy. The monaſtic orders muſt imperceptibly decay without the cruelty of turning numbers of inoffenſive men from their abodes to ſtarve, as it had been ſo inhumanly done in England. No bloody articles are inſtituted, for all men to acknowledge, as by Henry the eighth. The civil laws and courts of juſtice of Canada are preſerved; the criminal are eſtabliſhed to be the ſame, and their

their cauſes to be tried by juries, as in England. The poſſeſſions of laymen and eccleſiaſtics are eſtabliſhed, excepting thoſe of the regular clergy; for the propagation of the church of England, and the ſupport of her clergy, it is amply provided. In fact, no circumſtance ſeems to be omitted, which humanity and the chriſtian faith can dictate: nothing enjoined, but what good polity hath ſuggeſted, and reaſon can ſupport. And in no reign, ſince this kingdom hath exiſted, is there to be found one inſtance, in which the wiſdom of the inſtitution is ſo perfectly united with the precepts of Chriſt, and the virtues that dignify the beſt of men. In this place, it is impoſſible to abſtain from declaring that, to the immortal honour of the prelacy of this realm, they have, in the enacting of this law, afforded the moſt undeniable proof, that, by the doctrines which are taught in the evangelical writings, their actions have been truly directed. Among the biſhops, conſiſting of more than twice the number of the apoſtles; but one ſpeech-printing Iſcariot is to be found. Such is, in fact, the true ſtate of the Canadian ſtatute, for which the patriots and preſbyterians ſo audaciouſly defame their ſovereign, his miniſters, and the parliament itſelf. And I ſhall now aſk, on what pretext, effrontery can dare to aſſert the coronation oath has not been inviolably preſerved?

22. When king William came to the throne, he took the very oath before inſerted. The firſt article, "of governing the people according to the ſtatutes, laws, and cuſtoms," he violated by keeping three thouſand men in arms beyond the number limited by an expreſs ſtatute, to omit all other inſtances.

The

The ſecond article, " that law and juſtice, in mercy, were to be executed in all his judgements," was inhumanly violated by the Glenco maſſacre, authorized by his own hand, and the aſſaſſins were preſerved from puniſhment. Such was the union of juſtice and mercy in that prince, in the pardon and penſion of that nefarious perjuror Titus Oates; in aſſenting to the bill of attainder of Sir John Fenwick; and in a multiplicity of other inſtances.

The third article of " the coronation oath to maintain the proteſtant church, eſtabliſhed in this kingdom," was obſerved in the ſubſequent manner, in his firſt ſpeech from the throne. " And as I doubt not, ſays he, you will ſufficiently provide againſt papiſts, ſo I hope you will leave room for the admiſſion of all proteſtants, that are willing and able to ſerve." In conſequence of this deſign, a bill was brought into the houſe of lords, " for the abrogating of the oaths of ſupremacy and allegiance, and appointing other oaths." Thus the ſacramental teſt was to be aboliſhed, in order to admit every kind of diſſenter into place and office. But this intention was rejected by a great majority. The lords had not then forgotten, nor ever will, I truſt, forget, that thoſe very diſſenters had murdered their *king*; driven *them* for being a part in the legiſlature, ſubverted the conſtitution, eccleſiaſtical and civil; ſhed the blood of thouſands and ten thouſands of their fellow ſubjects; robbed them of their patrimonies and poſſeſſions, and filled the realm with rapine, deſolation, and ſlaughter.

This teſt, ſo grievouſly complained againſt by the preſent ſectaries, is obligatory on none but ſuch as accept either civil or military offices. It may then

alſo

alſo be taken, any time within twelve months, and then omitted, on the penalty of 500*l.* To excuſe offenders alſo an act is annually paſſed. And who are there, the quakers excepted, among the ſwarms of ſectaries, that refuſe this teſt, when either ambition or intereſt attend the taking of it? Do they not, on all ſuch occaſions, ſolemnly depoſe, on oath, rendered ſtill more awful by receiving the euchariſt, that the king is, alone, both head of the church and ſtate; then immediately abſolve themſelves from that ſacred obligation, and remain profeſſing a contrary opinion, in both reſpects, during life? on the other hand, the Roman Catholics, who, as theſe ſectaries aſſert, may conſtantly receive abſolution from their prieſt, for breach of oath, and ſacramental teſt, dare not enter into thoſe obligations; although to forſwear themſelves be a crime, the puniſhment for which may be inſtantly averted by a prieſt. But ſuch is the difference, that, whilſt every catholic refuſes to take the oaths, altho' he may be abſolved by papal power, every preſbyterian is himſelf a pope, or confeſſor, commits the ſins he likes, pronounces his own pardon, and abſolves himſelf. Such is the daily practice of all thoſe ſectaries.

A toleration, however, king William obtained for them. How well they deſerve that indulgence, their preſent writing and tranſactions ſpeak aloud.

When king William took the coronation oath of Scotland, he ſwore to maintain the proteſtant church of that kingdom, which was then epiſcopal, like the reformed church of England. The impreſſion which was made by that ſacred obligation was ſoon effaced from his conſcience: he ſpeedily aboliſhed that church, and eſtabliſhed preſbytery in its place.

To

To evince alſo how much the ſpirit of toleration actuated his conduct, a law was made, by which all perſons, educated in the catholic religion, or even ſuſpected of it, who ſhould ſucceed to any eſtates, before 18 years of age, were obliged to take the oaths of ſupremacy and allegiance; and the teſt, as ſoon as they came to age. Until this was done, the eſtate was to devolve to the next of kin, being proteſtant; and to return on taking the oaths. All popiſh prieſts were baniſhed; and, on return, adjudged to perpetual impriſonment. Burnet voted for this bill, and ſays, "that if a government find any *ſect*, in religion, *incompatable with its quiet and ſafety, it might, and ſometimes ought to ſend away all that ſect, with as little hardſhip as poſſible.*" Were this doctrine now carried into a law, what a bleſſed tranſportation would ſpeedily take place, from this kingdom and the colonies.

Such was the difference with which the diſſenters and the Roman catholics were then treated, although the land were ſtill reeking with the blood of king and ſubjects, ſlaughtered by the former; and with that of catholics, unjuſtly put to death for a plot which never had conception, but in the heads of regicides, perjurors, and preſbyterians. At this time alſo, the intended aſſaſſination of king Charles the ſecond, at the Rye-houſe, was freſh in all mens memories. By whom then has the coronation oath been violated; by your preſent ſovereign, or by king William?

Such then being the true ſtate of all thoſe accuſations, which the malignancy of the patriotic and ſectarian tribes have ſo falſely and ſo injuriouſly propagated againſt their lawful king; and ſuch the true ſtate of facts, reſpecting king William, I ſhall

now

now proceed to conſider both ſovereigns, relative to their public and their private virtues.

1. When his majeſty aſcended the throne of theſe realms, the nation was involved in the moſt expenſive war that had ever exhauſted it. It was become viſible to all men of underſtanding, as the fate of nations no longer depends on the moſt powerful arm, but on the longeſt ſupply of money; that, although our fleets and armies ſhould be attended with uninterrupted conqueſt, the impracticability of ſupplying the expence would ſpeedily reduce this nation, to accept ſuch terms as the vanquiſhed might think fit to impoſe on the conqueror. The firſt paternal care of the king, was to attempt the re-eſtabliſhment of peace, whilſt we ſtill preſerved our aſcendancy in arms. Lord Chatham, then in power, was not unknowing, that the diſpoſition of the Engliſh is to be eternally diſpleaſed with every pacification, however advantageous to their country. And that the loſs of popularity would inevitably attend whoever ſhould conclude hoſtilities. For this, and other ſecret reaſons, he evaded that taſk. The miniſtry was ſoon changed, and the war purſued with more invariable ſucceſs than during his preſiding in public affairs. Martinico and the Havannah, in the Weſt Indies, and Manilla, in the Eaſt Indies, were taken; beſides a multiplicity of other victories too numerous to be mentioned. And through the whole conduct of the war, ſince the change of miniſters, every undertaking was adequate to the purpoſe for which it was intended. Two expeditions were not neceſſary for compleating the ſame conqueſt. Millions were not thrown away on the reducing of an iſland, not worth a groat. Fortune no longer ſeemed to exult in elevating a miniſter

miniſter into admiration, by giving ſucceſs to armaments naturally diſproportioned to the attempt; but victory was the reſult of properly planning the expeditions, and of preparations adequate to the accompliſhment. An honourable peace was then concluded, of which we now ſee the excellence and importance. From that moment, the expences were leſſened, as far as it was practicable, and the debts have been ſince that time diminiſhed more than ten millions of money. The glory of the nation was never ſo great among foreign potentates; the commerce of the realm never ſo extenſive; nor the adminiſtration ſo free from every attempt to oppreſs the people, or to infringe their liberties. We have no German ſubſidies, nor inclination to diſturb the tranquillity of Europe; to exhauſt our treaſure; and to laviſh the lives of Britons in ſupport of alien intereſts.

1. When king William was preſented with three kingdoms, the nation was in peace. He immediately imbrued our hands in blood, and waſted our treaſure to aggrandize the Dutch, and carry his vengeance into execution againſt Lewis the fourteenth, for oppoſing his arbitrary intentions on his native country. At his acceſſion, 2,061,856*l.* was the whole ſum that was annually levied. With this a civil liſt, a formidable fleet, and an army of almoſt thirty thouſand men had been raiſed and maintained; 362,491*l.* were ſaved out of that ſum, according to account given into parliament; and the nation was abſolutely unincumbered with debt. During the thirteen ſeſſions of parliament, in king William's reign, 54,417,782*l.* were raiſed; in one year, 11,530,159*l.* and on an average, 4,185,983*l.* Your lands and neceſſaries of life were greatly taxed, and a debt left for us and our poſterity

of

of 17,000,000*l.* During this time, king William was defeated in every battle, in Flanders; he won that of the Boyne, in Ireland; and was forced to raiſe even the ſiege of Limerick. A ſcandalous peace was concluded, excluſive of the French proteſtants. The king had effectually loſt all credit with the Engliſh, they conſidered him as totally eſtranged from their welfare, and as one whoſe word was not to be believed. For theſe reaſons, queen Anne, in her firſt ſpeech, informed her parliament, "*that her heart was truly Engliſh; and that they ſhould always find her a ſtrict and religious obſerver of her word.*" All the true friends of the Engliſh conſtitution received intelligence of his death with pleaſure; the preſbyterian, ſectaries, and Dutch alone, heard of it with regret. The honour and the glory of the kingdom was ſo egregiouſly ſunk, that the lords, in their addreſs to the queen, after her firſt ſpeech from the throne, expreſs, that her ſpeech would have the ſame effect, both at home and abroad, of equally *reviving* the *hearts* of her *allies* and *ſubjects*. And ſo much had the crown lands been leſſened, by grants of king William, that, in the civil liſt act, then made, the ſum of 700,000*l.* a year, for that purpoſe, out of which, the queen annually preſented 100,000*l.* to the public expences, was fixed ſo high, as it is ſaid, becauſe the great grants made by king William had ſo much decreaſed the revenues ariſing from the crown lands. In his reign, parliamentary corruption was begun, continued, encreaſed, and entailed on the people. A ſtanding army was firſt raiſed and eſtabliſhed, and the kingdom involved in debts and continental connections; and all the neceſſaries of life firſt loaded with the payment of taxes.

1. So

1. So much for the *public Virtues* of theſe two princes. Since the day of his majeſty's acceſſion to the throne, he has ſhewn his paternal care, by endeavouring to leſſen the prices of the neceſſaries of life. He prohibited the exportation of corn to preſerve his people from famine, for which royal benignity, he was moſt indignantly treated; by being obliged to aſſent to an act, that by an ungrateful implication expreſſed a ſtretch of his prerogative. Since that time, he hath recommended it to his parliament, to whom the redreſs of ſuch grievances alone belongs. And that no remedy has been hitherto produced, is neither to be imputed to the king, nor to his miniſters. For, by what means can the landed intereſt be induced to leſſen the prices of proviſions, the rents of whoſe eſtates have ſo augmented with that oppreſſion of the people? can his majeſty, by his prerogative, or his miniſters, by their intereſt, ſubdue the profligacy and leſſen the diſſipation of the members in both houſes; or reduce the enormous expence that luxury demands? can the eſtates be again divided into ſmall farms; the commons reſtored to the poor; the number of horſes diminiſhed; or one inſtance of ſelfiſh profuſion be aboliſhed by royal or miniſterial power? is it juſt then, to impute the continuance of the high prices of all things to our ſovereign, and his ſervants, who cannot oppoſe ſuch oppreſſive practices?

In every inſtance of private virtue, as Son, Huſband, Father, Brother and Maſter, he ſtands unequalled among the race of kings; and a living example to private men. His marriage was the higheſt act of prudence, reſpecting his country. Her majeſty, deſcended from a race of ſovereigns, as ancient as any in Europe, and unallied ſo nearly

with any potentate, of dominions ſo extenſive, as that their quarrels may embroil this kingdom in hoſtilities, on their account, is fraught with every virtue that can adorn a woman, to whom the tongue of patriotic defamation has not dared to impute an error.

His time is paſſed in council with his miniſters; in reading; in the encouragement of ſcience; the protection of the imitative and mechanic arts; and, perhaps, by way of avocation, ſometimes in the actual exerciſe of them. The embelliſhment of his gardens give to the labourer bread, to his people pleaſure; and were the virtues of this royal pair transfuſed through their ſubjects, they would render this nation the glory of humankind. They are leſs ſuperior to their people by the exaltation of a throne than by that of virtue.

Through his reign, to this hour, no ſymptom of a ſanguinary diſpoſition, no act of cruelty has been viſible. His mercy is ſo diſtinguiſhed, that the remorſeleſs crew of preſent patriots charge it on him as a crime.

1. William the ſecond prince of Orange, father of king William, having impriſoned ſix of the provincial ſtates, in the caſtle of Loveſtein, marched the army of the United provinces, in the dark, inſidiouſly to ſeize the city of Amſterdam, and to enſlave his country. This horrible deſign was prevented by the ſole accident of the Hambrough poſt-boy paſſing through the army in the night, to Amſterdam, and alarming the citizens. This ſaved the place, and preſerved their liberty. William the third was born after his father's death. The late eſcape from deſpotiſm induced the ſtates to enter on the reſolution of eternally ſuppreſſing the office of ſtadtholder. During the youth of William

William the third, the ſole inſtructions, which he received, were imparted by John de Wit, the penſionary of Holland, a virtuous man, and a ſincere friend to the republic and his country. By his intereſt, the prince of Orange was made admiral and captain-general of the troops of the United Provinces. He willingly received theſe high offices, under the moſt ſolemn oath, of never accepting the ſtadtholderſhip, although it ſhould be offered him by the ſtates.

Notwithſtanding theſe obligations to that great man De Wit, who was of the Arminian faith, the prince excited the calviniſtical preachers, who are ever ready for the execution of miſchief, to inflame the populace againſt him: till, at length, they ſo far ſucceeded, as to incenſe the rabble to murder both John de Wit and his brother. Having thus proſpered in blood and ingratitude, the prince of Orange, aſſiſted by his calviniſtical teachers, abſolved himſelf from his oath, and aſſumed that ſtadtholderſhip which he had ſo ſolemnly ſworn never to accept.

When the French, under the command of Luxemburg, invaded the Dutch dominions on the ice, and "which, as Burnet ſays, would have had a very tragical concluſion, if a happy turn of weather had not ſaved them," Painvine was entruſted with the command of a ſmall fort, on a cauſeway, through which the French muſt have paſſed, had not the ice afforded the means of proceeding without ſtaying to take it. Painvine, foreſeeing what would be the caſe, that his defence would be uſeleſs, and being ſolicited to preſerve another town from the enemy, retired to Tergow, to reinforce that place with the troops and cannon. The fort alſo was allowed to be untenable. For this beha-

viour he was tried by a court-martial. He pleaded, that he left that place, on the requeſt of one of the towns, in order to preſerve it from the enemy. He was, nevertheleſs, found guilty of cowardice, ſentenced to have his ſword broken over his head, and to be baniſhed the dominions of the ſtates. The prince, not ſatisfied with this ſentence, he was again tried by a court, compoſed of general officers, and they confirmed the former ſentence. So far the laws of the United Provinces allowed. The prince of Orange, whoſe relentleſs ſoul was not to be ſatisfied with leſs than human blood, in violation of the law and juſtice, had him once more brought to trial before himſelf, and a court of ſupreme officers. He was then found guilty, condemned and executed. By this implacable purſuit, was not William the third, prince of Orange at once the judge and the predetermined murderer? his favourite doctrine of predeſtination effacing every humane ſenſation, and ſanctifying every act of cruelty. Patriots be for ever ſilent, reſpecting Jefferies, that inhuman judge, or determine of all men according to their deſerts.

From the day of his being Stadtholder, to that of his acceſſion to the throne of theſe realms, he was totally engaged in ſubduing the Loveſtein party, and in endeavours to become abſolute in Holland. Lewis the fourteenth oppoſed him in all his meaſures, not through affection, but through intereſt to preſerve the United Provinces in their preſent form of government. On this account, the king of France was firſt deteſted by the prince of Orange. This deteſtation augmented with every defeat he received from that king, which were equal to the number of battles in which he was engaged.

gaged. And there can hardly exiſt a more ridiculous ſtory, trumped up to create his conſequence, among the Engliſh after an unſucceſsful campaign, than that Lewis the fourteenth had ſent aſſaſſins into the camp, to put him to death; when it was his life alone, that was ſo precious to the French: ſince, by a long and uniform experience, they had been taught the inſufficiency of his generalſhip, and the certainty of their ſucceſs, whilſt he commanded. The reverſe of this they were ſoon taught, by the ſuperior abilities of the duke of Marlborough, to create whoſe importance no fictitious aſſaſſinations were requiſite to be invented.

During this time alſo, the regicides of his grandfather, thoſe who plotted to deſtroy his uncle, and every enemy to England, found aſylum and protection in Holland. He engaged with Oates in that fictitious plot, for murdering the king, on which ſo many innocent catholics were put to death, in order to excite the populace againſt his father, and to exclude him from the throne. He coincided with Ruſſel, Sydney, Ferguſon, and others, in the Ryehouſe plot, to aſſaſſinate the king. The two firſt had their attainders taken off, after his coming to the throne of England. Shafteſbury, Ferguſon, Burnet and others, found refuge near him; and Ferguſon, the preſbyterian teacher, and Burnet, the preſbyterian prelate, returned with him, when he landed in England.

James the ſecond, by ſuſpending and diſpenſing with the laws; by endeavouring to obtain an abolition of the Teſt act, and to admit papiſts, preſbyterians, and other ſectaries, into all offices, civil and military; by his attempts to introduce papiſts into power in the univerſities of Oxford

and Cambridge; by his bigotry, and deſigns to ſubvert the eſtabliſhed church, and to encreaſe arbitrary power, deſerved to loſe his crown. And he was expelled the kingdom juſtly. The revolution was, therefore, a bleſſing to the nation. And king William aſcended the throne of his conſort's father, and his own uncle.

That King, in his private life, did never manifeſt the leaſt love for ſcience, literature, or arts. His pleaſures were all *unnatural.* He delighted in blood, whether in war or peace. Slaughtering inoffenſive animals, by ſhooting, was his chief delight in the latter; in the former, that of his fellow-creatures. He was never elevated but in a day of battle; and, excepting one, he left all of them with diſappointment and diſgrace. He loved not the Engliſh; and in peace or war annually paſſed the ſeas to ſpend his time and Engliſh money in the ſwamps of Holland.

The pious queen Mary entered her father's palace, inſenſible to his fate: and ſhewed no kind of compunction on the remembrance of him, who had once inhabited it. One pious tear might have dropped and have been pardoned. Nor was ſhe ever reconciled to her ſiſter. From hence, may it not be reaſonably inferred, that tenderneſs of heart was not the characteriſtic of that *good* queen, who manifeſted no affection in thoſe inſtances, where nature is moſt prompt to exert it. Filial affection and that of a ſiſter were aliens to her breaſt.

Such are the public and the private virtues of their preſent majeſties, and of king William and queen Mary. Thoſe of the former princes are proved by the living teſtimony of their daily actions, whilſt all hiſtory evinces the facts which are related

of

of the latter. Mr. Lee may now continue in his former opinion reſpecting William and Mary. The moſt formidable Tommy Townſhend may unite with the learned counſellor, roar allegiance to dead princes, with a view to countenance their ſilence, reſpecting the living, and exert their oratoric powers againſt me, as often as they pleaſe. I deſire no other puniſhment, on theſe gentlemen, than that they may be obliged to *print* their *ſpeeches*.

It is a tale that has been aſſiduouſly propagated by the ſectaries, that popery has, at all times, been attended with ſlavery in this kingdom; and that the preſbyterians, and other revolters from the church of England, are, and ever have been, the faſt friends of freedom and the conſtitution. That the Roman Catholics are conſtant proſecutors of thoſe who, for conſcience-ſake, diſſent from their opinions; and that the latter have been, and are, the advocates for univerſal toleration and liberty of conſcience. I ſhall preſume to examine into the truth of this aſſertion, from facts alone. And with that view to lay the moſt material tranſactions of both before the public, and then leave it to their determination.

In the reign of king John, both the prelates and nobles diſclaimed allegiance to him; becauſe he had acknowledged his dependence on the pope, in temporal concerns. Langton, archbiſhop of Canterbury, was the perſon who began, conducted, and obtained Magna Charta, in his reign; and had it again confirmed in the ſubſequent. In the reign of Henry the third, the dignified eccleſiaſtics diſdained to ſubmit to taxes impoſed by the papal ſee, even in contradiction to their ſovereign's recommendation. And the biſhop of London pronounced, "if the mitre be taken from my head, a helmet ſhall

inſtantly ſupply its place." Stratford, archbiſhop of Canterbury, at the head of the clergy, in defence of thoſe parts of Magna Charta, relative to the church, oppoſed the encroachments of Edward the third. In that reign alſo, the parliament enacted, that none ſhould transfer to Rome cauſes appertaining to the king's court. In the reign of Richard the ſecond, all thoſe who might introduce bulls and mandates from Rome, were deprived of the king's protection, their lands and goods were forfeited, together with impriſonment and ranſom at the king's pleaſure, and outlawed if not to be found. This law of præmunire was ſtrengthened by Henry the fourth. The parliament, in the reign of Henry the eighth, aboliſhed the papal ſupremacy and juriſdiction. All theſe exertions, and eſtabliſhments, were accompliſhed by Roman Catholics. So far they were the friends of civil and religious liberty, and the ſteady ſupporters of the conſtitution.

With relation to ſuch motives and effects, hiſtory does not authoriſe me to deliver any thing on the part of the preſbyterians, and other diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed church. I ſhall, therefore, proceed to ſhew what miſchiefs have been attempted and accompliſhed by the Roman Catholics, and then bring parallels from the deeds of the ſectaries.

When Henry the eighth and the parliament had aboliſhed the papal, and eſtabliſhed the royal ſupremacy, as the Roman Catholic religion ſtill remained, but few and impotent inſurrections were the conſequence of that alteration; and theſe were eaſily ſubdued. Nothing material was excited in oppoſition to the farther reformation that was made by Edward the ſixth. In his reign, the ancient laws againſt heretics were abrogated with great judgment; but others, ſcarcely leſs ſanguinary againſt

againſt catholics, were enacted in their place. On the aſcent of Mary to the throne, the preceding laws of Edward were annulled; the Roman Catholic religion, together with the papal ſupremacy, were reſtored; and the laws againſt heretics moſt injudiciouſly revived. Thouſands, whom curioſity or averſion from proteſtantiſm, had brought to the inhuman ſpectacle, of chriſtians expiring in the flames, ſeeing the fortitude with which they died, and admiring their conſtancy in ſuffering, were enthuſiaſtically ſeized with perſuaſion, that the cauſe for which they expired muſt contain both truth and ſalvation. Thoſe, therefore, who came catholics, returned from theſe inhuman executions, converted to the proteſtant church. That puniſhment, therefore, which advances the very end which it was inſtituted to deſtroy, is certainly the moſt injudicious act of miſtaken polity. During this reign, about two hundred of the church of England expired in the flames, the martyrs of their faith.

Queen Elizabeth, being ſeated on the throne, the nation again returned to the church, as reformed by Edward the ſixth. But ſuch is the conſequence of reformation in religion, one conſtantly begets another, as if religion were intended for nothing elſe but to be mended, and greater evils may, by progreſſion, ariſe from that cauſe, than have been remedied by it in the beginning. For ſuch is the invariable diſpoſition of zealots, and of deſigning men, that the former never judging what the qualities of the human mind, the circumſtances of the times, the preſervation of religion and ſound polity require, imagine nothing to be compleat in reformation, whilſt any thing remains of the old eſtabliſhment; at the ſame time the latter ſeizing the

luſt

luſt of innovation, and of diſobedience to all power in the populace, artfully conducting it, in their criminal purſuits, under the deceptive diſguiſe of ſuperior holineſs, to thoſe ends which ambition, intereſted deſigns, or mere malignity of heart incite them.

In conſequence of theſe two cauſes, diſſentions from the church of England ſprang as naturally in this reign, as from the church of Rome, in the antecedent. The ſame arguments were uſed by the latter, as by the former, in defence of their diſſentions. The right of ſerving God in their own way, and to be indulged in their tenderneſs of conſcience, had ſtill the ſame weight and energy; and as no intention of eminent miſchief can be carried into effect, by the moſt refined in cunning, but by force or ſeduction, whenever ſuch deſigns are in agitation, and power is deficient, the latter becomes the ſubſtitute, commences and conducts the undertaking, by offering ſuch propoſitions as bear the face of right to all but the diſcerning, who, in ſuch caſes, are always few in number: and, like Caſſandra, are not believed in their predictions.

The reformers, in the reign of Edward the ſixth, had renounced the Roman Catholic faith, and moſt piouſly conſigned their anceſtors to the devil, for being idolaters. The puritans, for ſuch they were firſt called, paid the like compliment to the living; denominated all that remained of rites, ceremonies, and worſhip of the ancient religion in the reformed church to be idolatry; and, with like piety, ſentenced theſe profeſſors of the new faith to the infernal regions alſo. In this manner reformation as ſpontaneouſly grew out of reformation, as one polype from another, and as regularly became new exiſtencies. The tenets, on which they differed

and

and contended, were all founded in truth, and warranted by ſcripture. The goſpel was explained by every man, according as it beſt might ſerve his purpoſe; a multiplicity of ſenſes were found to be in the ſame text, and every one was a perfect judge of the truth and rectitude of what he read. By theſe means, every individual was right in his own opinion; and every man wrong, that differed from him: and thus being all right, as they conſidered themſelves, and all others wrong, as they were conſidered by them; all were right, and all wrong, at the ſame time. The principles, which were adopted by theſe puritans, were not examined by the criterion of human judgement, in order to determine, whether they would tend to the improvement of true religion, morality and virtue; but by that which every crafty and inſidious knave could twiſt the ſcriptures to expreſs, and to ſerve the purpoſes of moſt effectually ſeducing the populace.

The doctrines of Calvin, mixed with fanaticiſm, are irreſiſtable. Zeal is the ſharpened wedge, and predeſtination that tremendous weight which drives through all oppoſition. Theſe were adopted by the puritans, and applied progreſſively to all the purpoſes of national deſtruction. Leiceſter, Walſingham, Cecil, and others, were puritans at heart, and patrons of them openly. Theſe principles were countenanced as beſt adapted to ſupport their deſigns on the church lands, which were left unpillaged by Henry the eighth, of which Leiceſter and others obtained conſiderable portions. Theſe men ruled Elizabeth. Laws were enacted, which made it high treaſon, for a ſubject, born in England, to return a prieſt from beyond the ſeas to his native country. It was made treaſon, either to convert another,

another, or to be converted by him. It was felony, alſo, to entertain, ſecrete, or any ways aſſiſt a Roman Catholic prieſt.

By theſe ſanguinary ſtatutes, as many prieſts, of the Roman Catholic faith, have been drawn, hanged, cut up alive; their hearts torn from their bodies, whilſt palpitating in the executioner's hand, and thrown into the flames; their members ſevered, and expoſed on the public places, in which they ſuffered, as there were proteſtants that periſhed in the flames of Mary. Theſe victims had committed no other crime than that of being prieſts, and preaching their doctrines, like Auguſtin, who firſt promulged the ſame chriſtian faith, and eſtabliſhed that religion, for which they died, among our anceſtors. Not a man of them, when aſked, but would have willingly complied with taking any oath of allegiance to the reigning prince, in all temporal affairs. Not a man would take it in eccleſiaſtical, on the terms of life, ſincerely offered, when racks, in priſon, ſtretched him agoniſing in torture, nor when the inſtruments of execution and lighted fires were preſent to his eyes. One of theſe victims, whoſe name was Tunſtal, when the long detail of drawing, hanging, cutting down alive, ripping open, burning and diſmembering, was pronounced, heard it with that reſolution which a perfect conſciouſneſs of being right can alone inſpire; and inſtantly replied, *well, my good lord, this whole dreadful ſentence imports but one death.* Words which expreſs a ſublimity of ſentiment, and ſuperiority of ſoul, that nothing has exceeded, or can exceed. Many, alſo, who entertained them, periſhed by the hands of the public hangman. For theſe puritanical ſtateſmen had, by law, converted every laudable ſenſation of the heart, and act of humanity,

humanity, in parents, brothers, ſiſters, relations, friends, into felony and death.

Such was the miniſterial infliction: but by preſbyterian principles men are not made martyrs, but perſecutors. Religion is their inſtrument of miſchief, not their guide to ſalvation. Their faith, reſpecting the obligations of an oath, is taken from two lines in Hudibras:

'Tis he, that breaks the oath, who makes it,
Not he, who for convenience takes it.

It is uniformly ſeen, that hang but ſelf-intereſt, or even the paultry honour of a mayoralty or ſheriff-ſhip before their eyes, or put their property in danger, their conſciences are diſtended with the utmoſt facility; and no oath is too large to be taken down; of ſuch ſingular ſtuff are they compoſed, they dilate like a viper ſwallowing a toad. And when none of the preceding objects are offered, the ſmalleſt grain is too large to find admittance into ſuch tender conſciences.

Such was the parliamentary infliction of a puritanical miniſtry againſt the Roman catholics, whoſe plea of perſevering in that religion, which had ſubſiſted ſo many ages, and was firſt promulged among the Engliſh; was, on that account, more ſtrong than that for innovating and diſturbing the church ſo lately eſtabliſhed, and which, at length, ſubverted the conſtitution both civil and religious. In this manner, puritanical cruelty was exerciſed through the reign of that queen. At length, ſhe ſaw to what exceſs that fanatic and inſidious race were extending their deſigns. She felt the ill effects of their principles, and enacted laws to ſuppreſs them alſo. But theſe, in like manner, were

inju-

injudiciouſly formed. The evil was thereby augmented, and ſhe then too late, foreſaw the ſanguinary calamities which they would one day inflict on this deluded nation.

When James the firſt acceded to the crown of England, he brought from Scotland a thorough deteſtation of the preſbyterians, from whoſe machinations he had almoſt miraculouſly eſcaped. His opinion of them is beſt known from his own words, in his ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, written to his ſon; "Take heed, therefore, my ſon, to ſuch puritans, very peſts in the church and commonwealth; whom, no deſerts can oblige, neither oaths nor promiſes bind, breathing nothing but ſedition and calumnies. Aſpiring without meaſure; reviling without reaſon; and making their own imaginations, without any warrant of the word, the ſquare of their conſciences. I proteſt, before the great God, and ſince I am here as upon my teſtament, it is no time for me to lie in, that ye ſhall never find with any highland or border thieves, greater ingratitude, and more lies and vile perjuries, than with theſe fanatic ſpirits. And ſuffer not the principles of them to brook your land, if ye like to ſit at reſt." Such they were, in thoſe days; ſuch they are at preſent. The fatal effects which they produced in the reign of Charles the firſt, loudly pronounced, that no vigilance nor exertion of legal power, either by laws, already, or to be, made, can exceed the emergency of the preſent diſpoſitions of theſe men, who profeſs themſelves to be of ſimilar principles, and are engaged in like purſuits.

James, who abhorred the preſbyterians, was not diſinclined to the Roman Catholics. Cecil, his miniſter, a preſbyterian at his ſoul, beheld this propenſity

propenſity with pain; and wiſhed to eſtrange his ſovereign's heart from thoſe he liked. At this time, the moſt nefarious deſign of blowing up, by means of gun-powder, king, lords and commons, was undertaken by about fourteen of the papiſts. The intention was diſcovered by ſuch means, and prevented in ſuch a manner, that it is not without probability that the preſbyterian, Cecil, had contrived this execrable undertaking, by ſecretly practiſing on a few fiery bigots of the papal church; in order, by thoſe means, to avert the inclinations of James from his Roman catholic ſubjects. Among theſe, Garnet, the Jeſuit, ſuffered death. His crime was, not revealing this deſign, which had been imparted to him in confeſſion. I pretend to no excuſe for this Jeſuit's conduct. But certainly being, by his religious office, under the moſt ſolemn obligation not to reveal what was confeſſed to him, he had a better plea than Burnet, whom I conſtantly conſider as a preſbyterian prieſt. He, good man, left England, to ſeek an aſylum in Holland; becauſe he certainly knew what was intended, and feared that the undertaking then on foot was premature: for he ſays, "He thought the beſt thing for him to do was to go out of the way beyond ſea. This gave him great credit with all the malcontents, and he made the beſt uſe of it he could." After this avowal, he that will not conclude that Burnet, by diſregarding his oath of allegiance and not revealing what he knew, who had no excuſe, from vows or oaths to the contrary, and by encouraging thoſe he did, was not as great a villain, and merited death as much as Garnet, muſt find more coercive arguments than I have hitherto diſcovered.

The

The contrivers of this execrable intention received that puniſhment which was juſtly due to them. But by the moſt diligent ſearch it was found that no other Roman catholic was concerned in that plot; no arms were collected, nor military preparations made; ſo that no conſequence, in favour of papiſts, could have been derived from that horrible intention. It is difficult, therefore, to decide whether the folly or the iniquity be moſt enormous in that ſanguinary purſuit. For, had the event taken place, would it not have proved more fatal to the Roman catholics than to the reſt of the kingdom? for who can doubt that in the firſt impulſes of vindictive rage, they had periſhed by the hands of the proteſtants? This plot, the council of Cecil, and the preſbyterian intereſt in Scotland prevailed on James to perſecute and put to death numbers of Roman catholic prieſts, whoſe whole crime was ſolely that of being of the prieſthood, and preaching their doctrines for conſcience ſake, the very thing theſe preſbyterians claimed as the original rights of humankind.

Notwithſtanding James the firſt was animated with ſuch abhorrence of the preſbyterians, his pedantic and diſputatious ſpirit, and his affectation of being a profound Theologiſt, facilitated the means that brought his ſon to the block. In fact, he adopted the moſt egregious error that a ſovereign can commit, reſpecting ſuch diſſentions as may ariſe from a church eſtabliſhed. He ſuffered the clergy to enter into conferences and diſputes with the preſbyterian teachers. Whereas he ſhould have known that in ſuch aſſemblies neither truth nor reaſon have power to ſubdue enthuſiaſm and change the opinions of the controvertiſts. Motives of a contrary nature and too powerful to be

be overcome by argument, animate their hearts and diſputations. They are kindled into greater reſentment againſt each other, and from that impulſe ſeparate with more averſion; and therefore, are leſs open to conviction than when they met. No converts are made by ſuch diſputes. At the ſame time, by indulging the preſbyterians with thoſe conferences, the king imparted a conſequence to their cauſe; and afforded reaſon to ſuggeſt, that it contained ſomething which deſerved a refutation. All ſuch proceedings are deſtructive of the end to which they are intended, and unwarrantable by manly and ſound polity.

James being dead, his ſon Charles legally aſſumed the ſceptre of the three kingdoms. During the two preceding reigns, the puritans had encreaſed in number, and in riches. Theſe circumſtances augmented their power, and inflamed their inſolence. They were now no longer the humble ſuitors, for conſcience ſake, to be permitted to worſhip God in their own way. They entered on the reſolution and the means of demoliſhing every object which might reſiſt their deſigns, whether it were eccleſiaſtical or civil. The king, and the houſe of lords, religion and the laws, were alike to be aboliſhed. They were conſcious, however, that their machinations muſt prove abortive, unleſs ſome ſpecious plan were deviſed to create a diſcontent between the ſovereign and his ſubjects. Without that aid, on what pretext could they commence thoſe miſchiefs which they had projected. But in ſearch of that aſſiſtance, they were not long employed. In the laſt year of the reign of James, they had urged him to a war with Spain and the emperor; they then gave him a ſupply; and a petition againſt popery was preſented to the throne.

James being dead, and the nation thus involved in hoſtilities, a parliament was called, in which the preſbyterian members exceeded in number thoſe of the eſtabliſhed church. They ſoon diſcovered their ſtrength. On this their deſigns broke violently forth, and they immediately began to carry their ſeditious intentions into action. With this view they reſolved not to ſettle the revenues of tonnage and poundage on the king, beyond a year; and refuſed to grant ſuch ſupplies as were adequate to the ſupporting of that war which they had, in fact, begun. In this dilemma, to which they had reduced their ſovereign, they poured complaints of grievances, and made no proviſion for the civil liſt, nor for ſuſtaining the war. The king perceiving their deſigns, and that nothing but ſeditious purpoſes were intended, diſſolved the parliament; and, by his ſole authority, ordered his officers to continue in collecting the duties which had been uſually ſettled on his predeceſſors. Another parliament was called in the following year, and this, proceeding in a like manner, it was diſſolved, as the former had been, and for like reaſons. A third parliament was again called, and filled with the ſame men, or others of ſimilar principles. They greedily ſeized on the king's raiſing money by his own authority, as illegal and arbitrary, although by their premeditated refuſal of ſupplies, he had been compelled to it; and that it was not unprecedented. On this event, they formed a petition to the king, which contained ſuch articles as were reaſonably to be aſked, and which could not be refuſed without diſpleaſing the people. Theſe were, that no loan or tax might be levied without conſent of parliament; that no man might be impriſoned but by legal proceſs; and a few

few others. To theſe the king anſwered, "I will, that right be done, according to the laws and cuſtoms of the realm." But this was received as inadequate to what they expected. They again petitioned for a more ſatisfactory anſwer. His majeſty then gave his full aſſent, according to the uſual form in parliament: but their ſyſtem was, never to be ſatisfied with any return to what they aſked, and conſequently they reſolved on preſenting a remonſtrance againſt the king's having received tonnage and poundage. This deſign being known, his majeſty came to the houſe, paſſed the acts, which confirmed the rights and liberties, for which they petitioned, together with ſome others, and then prorouged the parliament.

It aſſembled again in the ſame year. The commons immediately began on the late ſubject, of the illegality of tonnage and poundage. The king informed them, in his ſpeech, that he did not claim it of right, but *de bene eſſe*; or, for the public welfare; and deſired it might be ſettled on him, as it had been on his anceſtors. No attention was paid to this requeſt. They not only continued the complaints on the grievances of adminiſtration, but now no longer talked of liberty of conſcience, to ſerve God in their own way; but erected themſelves into an inquiſition; enquired into, and condemned that liberty in others, who were equally entitled to it with themſelves; and debated concerning the increaſe of Arminianiſm and popery. Pym, alſo, moved in the houſe, that they ſhould engage in a covenant to maintain their rights and religion. They then reſolved to proceed on affairs relative to religion, before they entered on the conſideration of the tonnage and poundage. And

informed the houſe, that popery was countenanced by the biſhop of Wincheſter.

The ſpeaker of the commons, being called upon by the houſe, to read a remonſtrance, he refuſed to comply with it; when endeavouring to leave the chair, he was held in it by force, the doors were locked, and the ſubſequent proteſtation was read. "That whoever ſhould bring in innovations in religion, or ſeek to introduce popery or Arminianiſm, ſhould be accounted enemies to the kingdom." It ſeems difficult to decide, whether the effrontery of this proteſtation be greater, in their interdicting innovations in religion, who were then labouring to innovate, by eſtabliſhing calviniſm in the place of the church of England; or in denying that liberty of conſcience to others, which they themſelves aſſerted was the right of all mankind. On this, the king diſſolved the parliament.

The ſpirit of intolerance increaſed amongſt thoſe preſbyterians, exactly with their powers of carrying it into execution. Every thing was popery that remained, either in form of worſhip or of prayer. The mitre, the ſurplice, a burning taper, a piece of painted glaſs, were deadly ſins and remnants of idolatry. All were to be aboliſhed as odious to God, in order to effect a godly thorough reformation. At the ſame time they converted the very eſſence of chriſtianity to the moſt infernal purpoſes. They preſumed to ſeek the lord in prayer, to grant them ſuch things as no being but the devil could hear, without horror. They roſe from their knees, aſſerting it was obtained. They applied the wrathful texts of the Jewiſh theocracy, pronounced againſt idolaters, to the church eſtabliſhed, and converted Chriſt himſelf to become an inſtrument

ſtrument of their impious deſigns, by calling him their king Jeſus. All this they aſſerted to be undertaken in ſupport of that goſpel, which teaches charity to all mankind, and even forgiveneſs to our enemies. No falſehood was too flagrant for their affirmation; no deed too cruel for their undertaking, provided the tendency of them were to promote their abominable purpoſes. Two things there were, beſides the levying of tonnage and poundage, that afforded too much cauſe for their ſeeking the abolition of them. Theſe were the courts of high commiſſion, and Star-chamber.

During this time, the Scotch preſbyterians were equally engaged in like rebellious tranſactions. They entered into a ſolemn league and covenant againſt the epiſcopal church, eſtabliſhed in Scotland, and to erect calviniſm. In 1640, the parliament met, and immediately returned to their late grievances in religious and temporal affairs. It is again diſſolved; but the ſuppreſſion of the Scottiſh rebellion requiring ſupplies, which could not be raiſed without a parliament, another was called in the ſame year. On the 3d of November, began the ſeſſion of that parliament, which, before its diſſolution, entirely ſubverted the conſtitution, in church and ſtate; and exerciſed ſuch unremitting tyranny, and acts of barbariſm, as were even a diſgrace to rebellion. All this was done for conſcience ſake, for the liberty of worſhipping God in their own way, and for eſtabliſhing the throne of king Jeſus.

The ſame grievances were again urged by the commons. Pym carried up an impeachment againſt the earl of Strafford. He is committed to the cuſtody of the black rod. Pennington, a preſbyterian alderman of the city of London, followed

by a tumultuous populace, carried a petition, as from the city, againſt the diſcipline and ceremonies of the church; and ſoon after, with a like riotous attendance, he preſents another for the abolition of epiſcopacy. The commons then reſolved that the convocation had no right to make cannons; that the ſubſidies which they granted were illegal; and framed a bill for fining all that ſat in that aſſembly. And yet, all theſe rights exiſted in the clergy, long before the houſe of commons had a being, and had uniformly continued to make a part of the conſtitution of England to that day. Never were impudence, falſehood, and hypocriſy, ſo perfectly combined as in the fanatic commons of thoſe days. Archbiſhop Laud was now impeached of high treaſon, by Danzel Hollis, taken into the cuſtody of the black rod, and, ſoon after committed to the tower. And in this manner, the earl of Strafford, and this prelate, the chief ſupporters of the church and ſtate, and of greateſt abilities and reſolution, were taken from the king, and impriſoned.

A bill for triennial parliaments was, at that time, the ſubject of great clamour by the preſbyterians, as it is at preſent. That bill then meant only that the king ſhould not diſcontinue a meeting of parliament more than three years. This act was paſſed. The commons, with thanks to his majeſty, declared, that nothing now remained, but to teſtify their devotion to him, and to make him a glorious king. We ſhall ſoon ſee of what ſtuff their devotion was compoſed, and the means they purſued to make their ſovereign glorious.

One act of their devotion was to reſolve, that no biſhop ſhould have a vote in parliament. Another was to keep the Scotch army in pay; and to borrow money

money of the city of London on the ſubſidies, which was an act equally arbitrary and illegal with that of the king's levying tonnage and poundage by his own authority. There was now an undoubted rebellion in the kingdom: in fact, it had already long ſubſiſted. But the king fatally deferred to arm, and to defeat it. The articles of impeachment againſt lord Strafford were unequal to the accuſation, for if all of them could have been proved, they could amount to nothing like high treaſon. They therefore deſpiſed the regular proceedings of juſtice, proceeded by bill of attainder, and framed a law expreſsly made to put him to death, guiltleſs of the charge; which, oh that account, was as equally a murder, as if the ſame preſbyterians had aſſaſſinated him in the ſtreet.

Notwithſtanding this parliamentary outrage on the conſtitution, theſe fanatics, "whom no king can govern, and no God can pleaſe," headed by one Cornelius Burgeſs, followed by a mob, came riotouſly to the houſe of commons, exclaiming, *juſtice*, *juſtice*, againſt the earl of Strafford. For murder was *juſtice*, in the opinion of a preſbyterian teacher, at that time, as it appears to be in that of Prieſtley in the preſent. They inſulted the king, and when the juſtices of the peace attempted to commit the moſt audacious of them to priſon, the commons interpoſed, and committed the juſtices, for acting in defence of their ſovereign and the laws, againſt his rebellious ſubjects. In this way, they proved themſelves to be at his *devotion*, and making him a glorious king.

The day was now arrived, fraught with ruin to the conſtitution. The king, oh fatal and imprudent deed! ſigned the paper that appointed the commiſſion, by which the bill of lord Strafford's

attainder was paſſed in the houſe of lords, and another, that the parliament ſhould not be diſſolved without the conſent of the commons. Such was the iſſue of obtaining a triennial parliament. By theſe acts, he, in fact, ſubſcribed his own death warrant; and the hand that ſigned theſe papers, I had almoſt ſaid, deſerved to have that head, which belonged to it, taken from its ſhoulders by an axe.

And now it was viſible, that thoſe preſbyterian commons, thoſe friends of the people, theſe protectors of their rights and liberties, had not only prevailed on the king to renounce his lawful right of proroguing and diſſolving parliament; but that they had robbed their fellow-ſubjects alſo of their right of a general election, and of being repreſented by any other than that which was then ſitting. For this parliament never diſſolved itſelf, until the reſtoration of Charles the ſecond. May this precedent, ſo fatal, ſo ſanguinary, and deſtructive, prevent both the ſovereign to yield to any application from ſectarian ſubjects, and the people from abetting their machinations. For it is as certain, that the king ſhall ſuffer, by indulging their petitions, and the people be deprived of their rights and liberties, by men of ſuch principles, as that the ſun ſhall riſe to-morrow. And believe me, although at the day of judgement they ſuffer for their tranſgreſſions, yet, neither wiſdom, nor chriſtian patience ought to remit to that day of doom the puniſhment which they ſo truly merit.

The king then paſſed a bill, by which he renounced all right of levying tonnage and poundage, by his prerogative, or on any merchandiſe whatſoever; another to annihilate the courts of high commiſſion, and of the Star-chamber; and one alſo of pacification between England and Scotland, by which

which the demands of all the preſbyterian Scots were granted. Here every purſuit of the houſe of commons ought to have terminated. The levying of money, by prerogative-royal, the courts of high commiſſion, and Star-chamber, were aboliſhed; and liberty of conſcience was no longer oppoſed. But theſe envenomed ſectaries reſolved to proceed until the whole conſtitution of the ſtate were perfectly demoliſhed. Every conceſſion of the king was a freſh incentive for proceeding to new demands. And in this manner it will eternally reſult, when ſovereigns yield to the petitions of men who are, by principle, implacable, but with the death of that man who ſhall give credit to their hypocritical applications, and yield his aſſent to inſidious undertakings.

Every moment expedited the ruin of the king, in which no man was more inſtrumental than himſelf. He conſented to the abolition of epiſcopacy in Scotland. He diſmiſſed colonel Lunsford from the lieutenancy of the tower, on the application of the *commons*, that *they* could not confide in him; and ſir John Byron was placed in his ſtead. Twelve of the biſhops proteſted againſt all acts paſſed in parliament ſince they were withheld from ſitting in the houſe of lords. They were committed by the parliament to the tower, as guilty of high treaſon.

The treaſonable correſpondence being diſcovered, between the preſbyterian commons and the Scots, the king ordered Kimbleton, Pym, Hampden, Hollis, Haſlerig and Stroud to be apprehended. The commons reſolved to ſtand on their defence. The king demanded the members abovenamed in their houſe. They were abſent. The commons voted that demand to be a breach of privilege, and the city mob was raiſed to protect them.

At

At this time, his majeſty and the royal family being expoſed to great danger, retired to Hampton-Court.

The preſbyterian ſheriffs of London, accompanied with the train bands, and the populace, in arms, carried back the demanded members in triumph to Weſtminſter; whilſt the ſeamen and watermen, in boats, equipped with field-pieces, proceeded, from London Bridge to the ſame place. They were thanked by the commons and promiſed an ordinance for their indemnity.

Nothing is ſo fatal to a ſovereign as temporizing with rebels. It was now diſcerned how erroneouſly the king had conducted himſelf, in ſuffering theſe preſbyterian ſubjects of King Jeſus to proceed in violating the conſtitution, aſſiſted by his own aſſent. Whilſt they were openly diſregarding all legal obligation, and preparing to deſtroy him by arms, his majeſty imprudently conceiving that ſuch implacable demanders were to be ſatisfied by granting what they aſked, neglected ſuch military preparations as could alone, in thoſe days, and can, in the preſent, prevent the deſtructive purpoſes on which they always meditate; and which they will omit no probable opportunity of carrying into execution.

Sir John Byron, not anſwering the intention of the commons, they petitioned the king to deliver up to them the tower; and to place the fortreſſes and militia of the kingdom in their hands. Byron was diſmiſſed and Sir John Conyers made lieutenant of the Tower. Thus his majeſty conſented to diſarm himſelf.

Charles, by commiſſion, paſſed the bill that deprived the biſhops of their right of voting in parliament; and incapacitated the clergy from exerciſing any juriſdiction in temporal concerns.

The

The king, refuſing to put the militia into the hands of the commons, they immediately aſſumed that power. They demanded the diſmiſſion of his miniſters, as evil counſellors, and even to have the prince in their cuſtody. They reſolved to put the nation in a ſtate of defence, that the lords lieutenant ſhould bring to the houſe their commiſſions, and cancel them as illegal. And that the admiral ſhould prepare a fleet, and proceed to ſea in their ſervice. The king ſat up his ſtandard, and prepared for defeating thoſe rebels, by the power of arms, which he had too long and too fatally neglected, whilſt they were haſtening to that means of deſtroying him.

During the preceding part of this reign, but three Roman catholic perſons had ſuffered death, for being of that prieſthood. The priſons were, indeed, thronged with perſons of that religion, both eccleſiaſtics and laymen; but, with the increaſe of power among the preſbyterian commons, the ſpirit of perſecution proceeded with equal ſteps. The catholic prieſts were now to be brought to the gallows, for exerciſing their right of ſerving God in their own way. Goodman, a prieſt, was condemned to die. The king, in *mercy*, applied to the commons to ſave his life, and be ſatisfied with his being impriſoned or baniſhed. The lords and commons conferred and joined in a petition to the king, that Goodman be executed, and the laws put in execution againſt all prieſts, and jeſuits. Blood alone can ſatisfy the tender conſcience of a preſbyterian. His majeſty, however, did not conſent to Goodman's death. He died in Newgate, among felons. The king reſolved to commit no more ſuch cruelties; and refuſed to ſign the warrants of ſeven prieſts, condemned at one time to death, at the

the Old-Bailey. The preſbyterians then, ſeeing it in vain to ſeek the ſanction of the royal name to countenance their perſecuting reſolves, aſſumed the full power of life and death; and a number of men, whoſe whole crimes were being prieſts, were executed with all the ſeverity of that inhuman ſentence, which condemns to be hanged, cut down alive, emboweled, and hearts to be thrown into the flames. Such was the tenderneſs of the preſbyterian commons, who were at that inſtant roaring againſt the Roman catholic perſecutions in the reign of bloody Mary. Th s *mercy*, conſtantly unpardonable in a king, that is not their favourer, was publiſhed through the realm, as a proof of his majeſty's being a bloody papiſt, and of their being the true friends of Chriſt's goſpel. Their perſecuting ſpirit, for conſcience ſake, was ſo exerciſed in 1641, that they executed two prieſts, and ſentenced ſeveral others to death. This had a double effect. It withheld the merciful diſpoſition of the king from urging the Roman catholics to join his ſtandard, through apprehenſion, that all of that religion would thereby ſuffer, who might fall into the hands of the rebels. And the catholics were ſo intimidated by the ſanguinary proceedings of the preſbyterians, that, ſeeing there remained no other method to preſerve themſelves and their effects, ſome few of them oppoſed the king, whom they liked, and aſſiſted the preſbyterians, whom they had reaſon to deteſt. In the religion of ſuch catholics, rebellion effaced the ſin of idolatry. For in fact, it was loyalty to their ſovereign, that was the ſole cauſe of all the fanatic lies, groundleſs charges, and barbarous puniſhments, which were urged againſt all men of the church of England,

and

and Roman catholics. And to promote that malignancy, the cauſe of Jeſus was ſet up againſt their lawful king.

The parliament now voted, that whoever ſhould raiſe forces for their ſovereign, were to be deemed traitors. And they publiſhed a remonſtrance, declaring, that the ſupreme legiſlative authority was in the two houſes: and that the king had no right of withholding his aſſent from the acts they paſſed: They now committed the very crime, from which their rebellion had originated, and iſſued an ordinance, by their ſole authority, for levying tonnage and poundage. They paſſed another ordinance alſo for aſſeſſing, through the kingdom, a weekly tax of 34,808*l.* for the maintenance of their forces againſt their ſovereign: which, they impudently aſſerted to have been raiſed for his preſervation.

The priſoners, taken at Brentford, being releaſed by the king, on having ſworn not to take arms any more againſt him, Downing and Marſhal, two preſbyterian teachers, who had been conſtantly roaring againſt the pope, as the idolatrous whore of Babylon, aſſumed that very power which they had ſo vehemently execrated; and abſolved all thoſe releaſed priſoners from their oaths, who, again, engaged in the rebel army, through pure tenderneſs of conſcience.

The church of England was now demoliſhed. An aſſembly of preſbyterian teachers was conſtituted to ſettle the national religion, on the calviniſtical principles, doctrines and diſcipline; and the two houſes, and the City of London, united with the Scots, in taking the ſolemn league and covenant.

The preſbyterian, being now the eſtabliſhed church, by ordinances of rebellion, their teachers laboured to erect a government therein, which was

to

to contain the very powers, they had aboliſhed, as too deſpotic. Such as, thoſe of the keys, and of excommunication. Epiſcopacy was exterminated; the church lands were alienated, to pay the debts incurred by the two houſes; and the benefices diſtributed to their teachers, from whence the clergy of the church of England were expelled. And now, theſe preſbyterian teachers denied that liberty of conſcience to all other ſects, as well as to the churchmen of England, and they claimed both civil and eccleſiaſtical authority over mens perſons, properties, and conſciences. The ſpirit of perſecution thirſted for this power, in order to ſuppreſs all who differed in opinion from themſelves. They inſiſted on a ſtrict uniformity in diſcipline, faith and worſhip; and vehemently inveighed againſt toleration, which the independents, their natural ſpawn, determined to ſupport. They even haraſſed the houſe of commons to grant them ſuch powers as might enable them to compel, by perſecution, thoſe who ſhould preſume to diſſent from covenant uniformity, and the divine right of preſbytery. This the independents, in parliament, did in ſome meaſure prevent from being ſtrictly eſtabliſhed. The directory was enjoined, as the rule of worſhip, in all churches, under a pecuniary fine, for each Sunday's omiſſion. Whoever ſhould preſume to ſpeak or act againſt it was fined from five to fifty pounds. The Common-Prayer was forbidden, not only in churches, but in private families, under a like penalty. Every clergyman of the church of England muſt take the covenant, or be ſtripped of his living, and ſent, with his family, to ſtarve: and then an ordinance of the two houſes, unprecedented among chriſtians, was made the 2d of May 1648, againſt hereſy and blaſphemy.

Among

Among a variety of articles, theſe that follow are to be ſeen. That whoever ſhall affirm, that the Godhead and manhood of Chriſt are not diſtinct natures; that the death of Chriſt is not meritorious, that the ſcriptures are not the word of God; that Chriſt is not riſen; that there is no reſurrection, or a future judgment; ſhall ſuffer death, as in caſes of felony. And then, that whoſoever ſays, that all men ſhall be ſaved; that man, by nature, hath free-will to turn to God; that man is bound to believe no more than by his reaſon he can comprehend; that the baptiſm of infants is unlawful, ſhall be committed to priſon, till they can find ſecurity, that he would not either maintain or publiſh ſuch errors. Such was the luſt of eſtabliſhing abſolute dominion, by what was then called the legiſlature. By this ordinance, the churchmen of England, Papiſts, Arminians, Antinomians, Arians, Socinians, Anabaptiſts, and all other ſectaries, then exiſting, were doomed to perſecution.

The virulence of this preſbyterian ordinance deſtroyed the end for which it was intended. The independents revolted from them, and became their maſters. They were univerſally deteſted by all men of every other religion, or ſect, for their attempting to eſtabliſh this tyranny on conſcience. And this deteſtation alone induced them to aſſume the affectation of tenderneſs for the king's life, when they ſaw their tyrannical ſyſtem diſappointed by the independents. Theſe were the bleſſed ſeekers of the Lord, who tranſported themſelves to Boſton, in which place they purſued the dictates of the ſame perſecuting ſpirit, and put to death thoſe who dared to diſſent from them. In ſuch principles they have perſevered, and ſuch they are now exerciſing

erciſing againſt the lawful authority of their ſovereign and his parliament.

Pym, nicknamed king, by the mob, periſhed by the louſy evil. Thus periſh all ſuch rebels to their king.

Archbiſhop Laud, being deemed by the lords to be not guilty of high-treaſon, the preſbyterian commons commanded him before them; and without hearing any evidence, ſave that which was repeated by their counſel, they attainted him of high treaſon, for which he was beheaded. And now the courts of high commiſſion and Star-chamber, aboliſhed in name, exiſted in reality. The firſt, in the Calviniſtical church government; the ſecond in the houſe of commons: and thus the legiſlative power, and that of executing the laws, were united in the ſame inhuman beings.

And now, that abominable hypocriſy, hitherto inſerted by order of the parliament, in commiſſions to their generals, *to preſerve his majeſty's perſon*, was omitted in that to Fairfax.

I purpoſely decline from all deſcription of thoſe calamities which attended this infernal rebellion, in which fathers were ſlain by ſons, and ſons by fathers; in which all ties, parental and filial, by conſanguinity and marriage, of friend, of religion, and of humanity itſelf, were totally annihilated. Deſolation, rapine and ſlaughter, were let looſe to ravage; and every horrible act that fanaticiſm could deviſe, was perpetrated, with all imaginable fury.

At this time, the commons reſolve, under God, that the people were the original of all juſt power. That the commons, in parliament, had the ſupreme authority of the nation, without king or houſe of peers. Thus, as the commons were eſtabliſhed

tabliſhed to all eternity, unleſs diſſolved by force, or by their own conſent, every right in the conſtituents of electing a new parliament was extirpated, together with thoſe of the king and peerage; and the government was become an oligarchy.

The king, driven to diſtreſs, repaired to the Scotch preſbyterian army, in ſearch of an aſylum. Theſe loyal ſubjects ſold him to his Engliſh rebels, for 400,000*l.*

The Engliſh preſbyterians, in reſentment to the independents, for ſtripping them of power, now affected a tenderneſs for the king's life. Cromwel, conſcious of the true motive, ridiculed their hypocriſy. His majeſty was then brought before a ſelf-created high court of juſtice; he diſavowed their authority; was arraigned and ſentenced to be beheaded, as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and a public robber, and then they murdered him, at Whitehall, on the 30th of January, 1648.

Hence it may be ſeen, by what fatal progreſſion, from the pretence of ſeeking the liberty of ſerving God in their own way; from tenderneſs of conſcience; from oppoſing ſome few acts of extended prerogative, together with aboliſhing of the courts of high commiſſion and ſtar-chamber, eſtabliſhed by law, and annulled by the king's conſent; that virtuous motives never actuated the hypocritic boſoms of thoſe inſidious fanatics. Every thing conceded was an incentive to more arrogant demands. By his remiſſneſs maturely to prepare, by force to ſubdue their rebellious intentions, the rights of ſovereign and of ſubject were alike demoliſhed, and the kingdom was covered with human blood, and with oligarchic deſpotiſm.

God preſerve his majeſty; and may the people ſay, *Amen.*

The commons now reſolved, that a king, or the power thereof, in one perſon, was unneceſſary, burthenſome, and dangerous, and therefore to be aboliſhed: and an act was paſſed in both houſes, by which ſuch abolition was confirmed.

Things being thus far advanced, Cromwel entered the houſe of commons, with a file of muſqueteers; commanded the ſpeaker to quit the chair; told them, they had ſat long enough, unleſs they had done more good; and that they were no longer a parliament. He told Harry Vare, that he was a juggler; Henry Martin, and Peter Wentworth, that they were whore-mongers; Tom Challoner, a drunkard; and Allen, a public cheat. And ordered a common ſoldier to take away the mace, that fool's bauble. Harriſon then pulled the ſpeaker from the chair: which being done, and all of them kicked out, Cromwel locked the doors, and in the afternoon, diſmiſſed the council of ſtate, which had been appointed ſoon after the royal murder.

Oliver, with his council of officers, now aſſumed the ſupreme authority of the kingdom and diſſolved the parliament by their declaration. He then iſſued his orders, nominated and convened about one hundred and twenty perſons, who met him at Whitehall. He then told them, they had a clear call to undertake the ſupreme authority of the commonwealth. And then, by an inſtrument, under his own hand, with the advice of his officers, he committed the ſupreme authority to that 120 men, July the 4th, 1653. They were to ſit no longer than till the 3d of November, 1654. And three months before the expiration of their ſeſſion, they were

were to ſelect an equal number of others to ſucceed them; whoſe duration was not to exceed a year. He then, by way of ſpiritual compliment, aſſured them, he had not made choice of one perſon, in whom he had not the good hope that he had faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and love to all ſaints. Which ſaints were thoſe who had ſpread deſolation and bloodſhed in the cauſe of rebellion and murdered their ſovereign.

This aſſembly reſolved, that no perſon ſhould be admitted to any place or office in the government, unleſs the parliament, as they called themſelves, were ſatisfied of his real goodneſs. Theſe 120 elect of Cromwel were, in deriſion, ſometimes called the *godly* parliament; at others, Praiſegod Barebone's parliament. That honourable member was a ſeller of leather, a ſpeaker of ſpeeches; and no leſs formidable than the unmerciful Tommy Townſhend. It was the opinion of theſe ſelect men, that Chriſt would ſoon deſcend to reign in England. And, in order to purge the kingdom of iniquity, and prepare the way for him, they propoſed to extirpate all parſons and lawyers; to abrogate all laws and badges of ſlavery; to ſuppreſs all ſchools and univerſities, as heatheniſh inventions; together with all titles of honour and diſtinctions among men: and they actually proceeded to aboliſh the courts of chancery. And now, may it not be ſaid, that theſe fanatics had made a thorough reformation, whatever might become of its godlineſs?

This parliament of Praiſe-God Barebones, conſiſted of ſuch fools, intentionally ſelected, to anſwer Cromwel's purpoſes. About five months after they began to ſit, they had rendered themſelves ſo conſummately ridiculous, that Oliver now thought he might ſafely proceed in his aſcendancy to ſupreme

power. Accordingly, it was moved in the houſe, that the welfare of the commonwealth required they ſhould ſit no longer: and that it was fit they ſhould reſign their power to the Lord General. On this motion, the ſpeaker, with many of the members, repaired to Whitehall: and, by a written inſtrument, reſigned their power into the hands of Cromwell. Some of the members ſtill remained with Barebones in the houſe. Cromwell never did things by halves, or with heſitation. He immediately ſent *White*, an officer, with ſoldiers, to the houſe of commons, which having entered, they demanded to what intent they were ſitting there. *To ſeek the Lord*, was the anſwer. Piſh, replied *White*, the Lord has not been within theſe walls theſe twelve months: and then turned them all out.

Lambert, and the council of officers alſo, reſigned their pretenſions to power, and declared, that the government of the commonwealth ſhould reſide in a ſingle perſon; and that Oliver Cromwell ſhould be that perſon, with the title of Lord Protector of the commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, and all the other dominions thereunto belonging.

Cromwell was now ſole ſovereign of three powerful kingdoms, without either lords or commons, to incommode his undertakings. Such was the reſult of ſeeking the Lord to murder their king, and of liberty of conſcience to ſubvert the conſtitution. Oliver was a man formed by nature to apply the principles of thoſe implacable ſectaries, to perpetrating the deeds of that ſanguinary æra. He loſt not his time in ſpeculative deſigns, which moſt frequently prove abortive; but caught occaſions as they roſe, dared to be equal to what they offered, and probably attained to that amazing degree

gree of ſovereignty, becauſe he diſcerned not to what height he was aſcending before he reached the ſummit. Few men of exalted virtue have, at any time, been capable of great reſolution. There have been, indeed, numbers of them poſſeſſed of paſſive fortitude to a ſurpriſing exceſs. Thouſands with the utmoſt firmneſs, have died martyrs to religion, for one who, by active virtue, has dared to ſave his country, without being animated by the intereſted ambition of acquiring dominion for himſelf. Sovereigns that would imitate Oliver in every thing but his crimes, and add that vigour to deeds of righteouſneſs, which he imparted to thoſe of iniquity, would be the bleſſing of their people, and the admiration of the world. Subjects expect a firm and active adminiſtration in their king. And, although the current of his reign may flow in one continued ſtream of tranquillity and ſmoothneſs, even the uniformity of that happineſs too frequently diſpleaſes. Love of ſovereigns is but a feeble paſſion in their ſubjects. If they be not taught to fear and feel for their tranſgreſſion, the popular influence becomes exuberant; tumults, ſedition, and even rebellion itſelf, ſhall attempt and ſometimes ſucceed in dethroning a virtuous prince, who adds not a vigorous exertion of authority to a proper mode of imparting beneficence.

Oliver, who was now abſolute, was, nevertheleſs, too well inſtructed in the nature of mankind, and the principles of fanaticiſm, which, at that time, diſgraced the human race, to exert a ſovereignty without offering an oſtenſible object, of uniting others in the ſupreme legiſlative power. Attended, therefore, with a ſtrong guard, accompanied with the great officers of ſtate, the lord-

mayor and aldermen of London, he proceeded from Whitehall, to that of Weſtminſter. There he received that writing by which he was authoriſed to govern the three kingdoms. He then took the oath which was prepared for him; and aſſumed the chair of ſtate, with putting on his hat. The commiſſioners then delivered him the broad ſeal, and the lord-mayor the city ſword, which was immediately returned to him.

By this inſtrument, the ſupreme legiſlative power was lodged in the protector and a parliament. The executive in him and his council. A variety of conditions were therein inſerted, imparting that regal power, in many inſtances, of which they had deprived the late king and limiting it in others. All which, however, was ſo contrived, that he might obſerve them, or not, as he pleaſed. For none, but perſons of whoſe integrity he was to determine, were to conſtitute that parliament. This, in effect, was equal to a nomination of the members. He was obliged to call them together but for ſix months, once in three years; and, during the interval of their ſeſſions, he and his council were anthoriſed to enact what laws they liked. Such was now the freedom and power of parliament for which ſo much blood had been ſpilt.

The office of protector was appointed to be elective and that by the council. All kinds of ſects in religion were tolerated. The Roman catholic and church of England were proſcribed. He was then proclaimed Protector through all England, with the ſame ſolemnity which would have attended the acceſſion of a king. The nation was taxed with raiſing a revenue, for the maintenance of 10,000 horſe, 20,000 foot, and a conſiderable fleet.

Cromwell

Cromwell and his council, by an ordinance, united England and Scotland in one commonwealth and one government. The parliament meeting, and entering into diſputes, relative to their right of aſſembling, and of the inſtrument which conveyed the antecedent powers to the Protector, Oliver came to the painted chamber, ſent for the members, reprehended them for their inſolence, placed a guard at the door of the houſe of commons, and ſuffered none to enter who would not ſubſcribe to be true and faithful to the Lord Protector: and that he would neither propoſe nor conſent to alter the government, as it was ſettled in one perſon, and a parliament. Three hundred of them ſubſcribed this recognition, in a few days; and Harriſon, who refuſed it, was taken into cuſtody by a party of horſe. The houſe, however, perſiſted in debating on the preceding ſubjects; but voted Cromwell Protector for life. When this parliament, not correſponding perfectly with the views of Cromwell, he diſſolved them, after a ſeſſion of five months.

If this act of Oliver be compared with that of Charles, when he went to the houſe of commons and demanded ſeven rebellious members, it will appear, that the king required that to be done to which he had not the means of enforcing an obedience; expoſed his weakneſs, and invigorated the oppoſition of his enemies. Cromwell, prepared with force, dated with firmneſs, intimidated his opponents, accompliſhed his deſign, and ſecured that ſovereignty, which can never be effectually maintained, but by the application of ſuch power, in proportion as the circumſtances of things may occaſionally require it. He knew that to truſt to a war of words, in St. Stephen's chapel, would be to be undone.

undone. He and the council now ſuppreſſed the publication of news-papers, without leave of the ſecretary of ſtate, as well as of all books and pamphlets unlicenſed. Thus the liberty of the preſs was ſent to the devil, after all the other liberties which the ſectaries had diſpatched before it.

Oliver convened a new parliament, from the three kingdoms to meet at Weſtminſter; but he ſuffered no member to enter the houſe who had not been approved by his council, and had obtained a certificate of approbation from them. Pack, an *independent* alderman of London, propoſed, in the houſe, to inveſt Cromwell with the title of *king*; and it was carried by a majority, that the crown ſhould be offered him. But the officers of the army oppoſing with menaces the accepting of that title, Cromwell, who knew when to perſevere, and when to relax, as the power of arms was with or againſt him, with prudence and hypocriſy, declared, he could not, with a good conſcience, accept the government under the title of king. He was not ſo bigotted as to riſque his ſovereignty for a name, or to loſe three kingdoms for a maſs, like James the ſecond. His powers of protector were enlarged, They authoriſed him to appoint his ſucceſſor, and fixed his annual revenue at 1,300,000*l.* At this time a new houſe of peers was created. Cromwell met them and began his ſpeech, my lords, and you the knights, citizens, &c. The commons re-admitted their excluded members, inveighed againſt the conſtituting of a houſe of peers, and diſputed the protector's authority to convene them. My lord Hewſon, the cobler, and my lord Pride, the drayman, were peers of this right honourable houſe. Cromwell, in this houſe reſolved to ſupport thoſe lords he had made, and diſſolved the par-

parliament. And there ended every proceeding relative to ſuch aſſemblies, during Oliver's life. The protector died the next year; and it muſt be an injuſtice not to confeſs, that, whilſt Oliver alone poſſeſſed and exerciſed the ſupreme authority, the nation was revered by all the potentates of Europe.

Richard Cromwell was now proclaimed protector; but was ſoon depoſed. The members of the long parliament returned, to the number of forty-one. Thoſe who had been excluded, in 1648, were not admitted. Theſe forty-one publiſhed a declaration, that they would act without a protector or houſe of peers, aſſumed the ſtyle of keepers of the liberties of England, and iſſued all writs, patents, &c. in their names. This fag-end of the commons was, in deriſion, called the rump. The army demanded a general, and ſhare in the government. The parliament diſmiſſed Lambert, Deſborough, and others. The ſoldiers mutinied. Lambert met the ſpeaker going to the houſe, turned him back, and the rump was again diſperſed.

It was the army that now aſſumed the ſupreme power, and choſe Fleetwood their general. They conſtituted twenty-three men, of whom the greateſt part were general officers; and indued them with the care of government under the name of a committee of ſafety. The committee of ſafety now, in their turn, yielded to the rump, which again reſumed the government. They appointed a council of ſtate. Monk arrived, the ſecluded members met him at Whitehall, and voted him general of all the forces of the three kingdoms. The act alſo was now paſſed, which diſſolved that houſe of commons, that for 19 years had proved ſo fatal to the liberties of this nation. A council of ſtate then aſ-

ſumed

ſumed the government of the realm; and Charles the ſecond was reſtored.

Whoever ſhall attentively conſider the principles of theſe fanatic rebels, will certainly diſcern that, in civil and religious tenets, they neceſſarily lead to the deſtruction of all the conſtitutional rights of this kingdom, and the erecting of deſpotiſm over our ſouls and bodies. It is abſolutely indiſputable, that liberty, both civil and religious, were but mere words, by which the people were conſtantly miſled to the deſtruction of their own happineſs; and that the reality of obtaining thoſe bleſſings did, not at any time, enter the imaginations of their ſeductive enſlavers, or once appear in their tranſactions. During this term of nineteen years, oppreſſion and cruelty diſcriminated all their parliamentary ordinances and actions, under various modes of tyranny. 1ſt. The two houſes, without a king and biſhops. 2d. An eternal houſe of commons, or oligarchy, without the lords. 3d. Cromwell and a council of officers. 4th. A protector and one hundred and twenty men, nominated and convened by his orders. 5th. A protector alone. 6th. A protector, and a houſe of commons, conſiſting of members only which he approved. 7th. A protector and a parliament of new-made lords and commons. 8th. Richard Cromwell, protector, with a parliament. 9th. Rump parliament. 10th. Keepers of the liberties of England. 11th. Lambert and the army. 12th. The rump again. 13th. A council of State.

At length, after multiplied oppreſſions and aggravated cruelties had been relentleſsly exerciſed under this eternal revolution of abſurd forms, and anarchical tyranny; after the devaſtation of the realm, by ſlaughter, rapine, and fanatic fury, had

ſo

ſo long revelled in full career, no end was ſeen of their calamities but by returning to that very form of government, which they had deſtroyed. Charles the ſecond and the conſtitution were reſtored together; an event which, although at preſent it be affectedly treated with neglect, is undoubtedly equal in national advantages to the revolution. Unleſs the re eſtabliſhment of the conſtitution, which was abſolutely ſubverted, be a leſs felicity than that event which prevented its demolition.

During the reign of Charles the ſecond, the ſame preſbyterian ſpirit of perſecution, democracy, and king-killing prevailed. Popery and ſlavery were conſtantly united in their mouths, which never exiſted in the realm. Preſbyterianiſm and liberty were, in like manner, conjoined, that never dwelt together. And, under the name of proteſtants, they inſidiouſly connected themſelves with the church of England, againſt which they as really proteſted as againſt the papal. Theſe gave pretext to all their iniquitous intentions. In conſequence of this relentleſs preſbyterian ſpirit, the prince of Orange, lord Shafteſbury, Ruſſel, Sydney, and others, entered into a confederacy with Titus Oates, Bedloe, and ſuch perjurers, to forge a plot, which was, to accuſe the Roman Catholics of conſpiring the death of the king. The fulleſt diſproof of what they ſwore was of no avail: and a number of innocent men were ſacrificed on the infernal altar of preſbyterian perfidy, in whoſe religion regicides alone are ſaints. This forgery not anſwering their deſign, the ſame perſons, with Ferguſon, Rumbold, and others, all preſbyterians, reſolved on the aſſaſſination of the king, at the Rye-houſe, on his return from Newmarket. An event, totally unforeſeen,

unforeſeen, prevented that intended murder from being carried into execution.

James the ſecond, that injudicious bigot, intending to abrogate the teſt-act, and alike admit papiſts, preſbyterians, and all others of the ſectarian tribes, into all offices, both civil and military, the preſbyterians became his faſt friends, and avowed abettors of his deſigns on the conſtitution. They received this gracious offer with the moſt profound profeſſions of loyalty to his perſon, and with the greateſt gratitude for his goodneſs. In their addreſſes, thanks and praiſe were accompanied with virulent ſuggeſtions of what they had ſuffered from the church of England. In theſe they denominated the Roman Catholics, their brethren and fellow-ſufferers for conſcience ſake. "Lob, whom Burnet calls, an eminent man among the diſſenters, was entirely gained to the court, and adviſed the king to ſend the biſhops to the tower." He was the Father Petre of the fanatics. At the ſame time, "the popiſh nobility, and almoſt all of every degree, preſſed the king earneſtly to let the thing fall." Sunderland, the new and occaſional convert, for one reaſon; and Petre, the Jeſuit, for another, were not among the diſcreter Catholics. At the ſame time, the archbiſhop of Canterbury, with ſix of his ſuffragan prelates; the univerſities of Oxford and Cambridge; the eccleſiaſtics of the church of England, and the Tories, by open and honeſt means, oppoſed the king's deſpotic deſigns; whilſt the Whigs, by ſecret intrigues, invited the prince of Orange into this kingdom.

The revolution was thereby effected. And yet, theſe ſectarian crews are at this day moſt audaciouſly aſſuming a degree of merit, for effectuating that

that very revolution which they oppoſed. Such is the exceſs of confidence and falſehood in theſe men. No ſooner had William aſcended the throne of his exiled father, than theſe very preſbyterians addreſſed him in terms of equal loyalty, and rejoiced as much in his elevation, as if they had been the ſole means of his riſe. The archbiſhop, and five of the biſhops, without whoſe glorious oppoſition William had never been crowned king of theſe realms, were deprived of their ſees, and reduced to live on their private and ſlender incomes; becauſe they dared not to trifle with their conſciences, reſpecting former oaths. At the ſame time, a part of their eccleſiaſtical revenues might eaſily and ought to have been reſerved for men of ſuch integrity, by appointing coadjutors, during their lives, to officiate in their dioceſes. But William had no affection for the church of England. He was convinced, from the murders of De Wit, in Holland; from their ſupporting, by perjuries, the forgery of the popiſh plot; and their actual conſpiracy to aſſaſſinate king Charles the ſecond; and from what he felt from the ſame principles in his own boſom, that the preſbyterians had no other motives to their actions than ſelf-intereſt; and that they would ſupport the worſt ſovereign that ever reigned, when it conduced to their iniquitous advantages, to the ruin of the beſt, who oppoſed them. He therefore indulged them, during his ſitting on the throne; and although he had ſolemnly conformed to the church of England, he kept one Carſtairs, a Scotch preſbyterian, to be his domeſtic chaplain, to whoſe advice he paid great regard.

It is an obſervation of a political writer, of the moſt exalted eminence, that Cæſar was as much a greater villain, and enemy to his country, than Cataline,

Cataline, as the deſtruction of the Roman liberties exceeded the intending of it. The ſame may be applied to the preſbyterians and catholics, with this difference only, that the latter did never intend to ſubvert, but always ſupported the conſtitution, whilſt their religion prevailed; and, after it was exploded, had no other views than the reſtoration of their church. Beſides this, their attempts were feeble, and even that execrable plot, of the 5th of November, was undertaken by fourteen only, unknown to all the others of that religion; from which time they have lived the moſt peaceable of ſubjects, uncomplaining of thoſe penal laws which ſtill hang over them; and not only reſcind the free exerciſe of their religion, but are unchriſtianly ſevere in the civil rights with which the ſectaries have been indulged. Theſe laws, however requiſite they might have been at their inſtitution, are they not at preſent a diſgrace to government, and to the liberal ſpirit of our church and conſtitution?

In the mean while, the preſbyterians, during the grand rebellion, man, woman, and child, were engaged, with all their powers, to ſubvert the conſtitution of this realm, both civil and eccleſiaſtical, and effected it; for whilſt the men were fighting in their fanatic cauſe, the women and the children were ſeeking the lord in prayer, for that ſucceſs, which deſtroyed their rights and liberties. From that day, to the preſent, they have uniformly perſiſted in being the friends, advocates, and promoters of continental connections; wars for alien intereſts; augmenting taxes and accumulating debts. They ſupported the eſtabliſhment of a ſtanding army; the converting triennial into ſeptennial parliaments; by enacting acts, by ſuſtaining parliamentary corruption, and every law, which they now pretend to execrate;

execrate; becauſe their own iniquities and rebellious actions have rendered it impracticable for them to be diſcontinued, without the danger of permitting them to effectuate their rebellious purpoſes.

No ſooner was his preſent majeſty enthroned, than their teachers, either becauſe the annual ſum which by his grandfather had been given among them, was diminiſhed, or no longer paid, began to feel *conſciences* again grow *tender*. God, like the Diana of the Epheſians, was now once more to be ſerved in their own way; becauſe, by that craft, they had their wealth. They then returned to their old rebellious practices. The king was traduced with leſs cauſe, and more enormity, than ever ſovereign had known before. Popery was again aſſerted to be coming in. The articles of the church of England grew offenſive, and application to parliament was made to have them altered. Tythes were Jewiſh, popiſh, and to be aboliſhed; and the teſt-act to be repealed. All theſe were ſeditious clamours, excited for reaſons ſimilar to the preceding in their rebellion againſt Charles the firſt; and clamours only they can be juſtly deemed: for of what avail is the ſacramental teſt to keep theſe men from honours, poſts, and places? on ſuch occaſions, were the bread as large as St. Paul's cathedral, and did the cup contain as much wine as the great tun at Heidelberg, they would ſwallow every grain and drop without heſitation or a wry face. At the ſame time, although the oath of allegiance has been taken in the morning, they will declaim againſt the lawful power of their ſovereign before night; and with the ſacrament, yet within them, execrate that very church to which they had ſo ſolemnly conformed. Decide then, my fellow-coun-

countrymen, of the church of England, whether, from the hands of Roman catholics, or of preſbyterians, your deſtruction be moſt likely to proceed. Reflect on the rebellious acts of the Boſtonian fanatics, who would impoſe on you alone the taxes to ſupport the ſtate; admire and applaud the wiſdom and the juſtice of parliament in beginning a reformation of the catholic church in Canada, by a truly chriſtian indulgence of religious liberty; and in extending the loyal ſubjects of Quebec behind theſe reſtleſs hypocrites. Senſible of their happineſs beneath his majeſty, they will be ready to employ their arms to quell rebellion, whilſt the preſbyterian race, who, by lying calumnies, ever traduce their ſovereign, would terrify you with the coming in of popery and ſlavery; ſeduce you from allegiance, and incite you to arms. Yet ſuch is the indiſputable fact, that, during the fourteen years in which his majeſty hath reigned over us, neither this kingdom, nor any other ever enjoyed ſo continued a ſeries of felicity, in which not one attempt has hitherto been made to invade your property, to diminiſh your rights and liberties, or to deſtroy the lives and treaſure of his ſubjects. And to the refutation of this truth, I defy all mankind.

Believe not, therefore, that your king, who is eminently dignified with every virtue of Son, Father, Huſband, Brother, Friend, whoſe acts pronounce him merciful, and by whom all your complaints have been removed, as far as his authority can extend, can ever entertain an idea that may tend to leſſen your felicity, or prevent its improvement.

At the ſame time, be confident that the men of theſe days, who are actuated by like principles with

with thoſe rebellious fanatics of Charles the firſt, whoſe ſouls are fraught with every vice, will convert religion to their inſtrument of iniquity, to ſeduce you to rebellion, and to promote the triumph of their deſpotiſm. Appeal to your own ſenſations, and you ſhall find, that their ſeditious acts can mean but to delude you to their nefarious and intereſted purpoſes, by erecting their dominion, and eſtabliſhing your ſlavery, which their anceſtors ſo perfidiouſly accompliſhed. Have not the Jeſuits, who entertain principles leſs pernicious to government, and whoſe actions bear no compariſon in iniquity with thoſe ſectarians, been juſtly expelled from almoſt all the realms of Europe? exert, therefore, my countrymen, your indignation againſt ſuch inſidious and deſtructive villainy. Rouze from your ſeduction; and manfully proceed to every act of loyalty to the beſt of kings; to the preſervation of your rights, liberties, conſtitution and country.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM
15 JAN 60